THE

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

BC

Under the Direction of

MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS { RT. REV. MGR. JAMES F. LOUGHLIN, D. D.
RT. REV. MGR. JAMES P. TURNER, D. D., V. G.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem. S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXXIV.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1909.

PHILADELPHIA:

211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1909,
By P. J. RYAN,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

70766

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE.

Anarchism in India and Its Consequences—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P. 507
Ancient Scottish Hospitals—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B. 597
Barrett, O. S. B., Dom Michael. Ancient Scottish Hospitals ... 597
Barrett, O. S. B., Dom Michael. The Pioneer Scottish Seminary 215
Blessed Virgin in the York Cycle of Miracle Plays, The—Rev. Francis O'Neill, O. P. 439
Capture of Constantinople, The—R. F. O'Connor 125
Christ of History and the Christ of Faith, The—Rev. Simon FitzSimons 535, 693
Christianity of the Future, The—Rev. Ferdinand W. Haberstroh, S. J. 206
Church and State—Rev. M. M. Hassett 112, 283
Clergymen Mathematicians—James J. Walsh, Ph. D., M. D. 577
Communium Rerum—Encyclical 325
Confession, H. C. Lea on St. Jerome and Sacramental—Rev. John E. Graham 319
Constantinople, The Capture of—R. F. O'Connor 125
Cox, S. J., Rev. Ignatius W. Pragmatism 139
Currier, Ph. D., Rev. Charles Warren. The Newest Phases of the Eastern Question 81
Currier, Ph. D., Rev. Charles Warren. The Situation in Spain 522
Dale, Darley. On the Revelations of St. Bridget 224
Dante as a Preacher and Teacher of Righteousness—M. Lloyd. 54
Dreamer of the Seventeenth Century, A—E. Hickey 99
Dunne, M. A. The Eschatology of the Poets: A Study in Optimism 407, 617
Eastern Question, The Newest Phases of the—Rev. Charles Warren Currier, Ph. D. 81
Empress of the French, The Last—R. F. O'Connor 422
Encyclical—Communium Rerum 325
England and Some of Its Lessons, The Fight for the Schools in —Very Rev. John T. Murphy, C. S. Sp. 71
England and the Sultan—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P. 45
England in the Later Penal Times, Missionary Life in—Rev. Bernard W. Kelly 718
Eschatology of the Poets: A Study in Optimism, The—M. A. Dunne 407, 617
Faith, The Christ of History and the Christ of—Rev. Simon FitzSimons 535, 693

PAGE.

Fifty Years of Italian Unity—John J. O'Shea..... 385
Fight for the Schools in England and Some of Its Lessons, The —Very Rev. John T. Murphy, C. S. Sp..... 71
FitzSimons, Rev. Simon. The Christ of History and the Christ of Faith 535, 693
Foundress, An Irish—R. F. O'Connor..... 645
French, The Last Empress of the—R. F. O'Connor..... 422
French Revolution, Pius VII. and the—Donat Sampson. 19, 235, 456
Goddess of Reason "in Loco Parentis"—John J. O'Shea..... 61
Graham, Rev. John E. H. C. Lea on St. Jerome and Sacramental Confession 319
Grey, Litt. D., Francis W. The Sources and Destiny of the Oxford Movement 486
Haberstroh, S. J., Rev. Ferdinand W. The Christianity of the Future 206
Hassett, Rev. M. M. Church and State.....112, 283
H. C. Lea on St. Jerome and Sacramental Confession—Rev. John E. Graham..... 319
Hickey, E. A Dreamer of the Seventeenth Century..... 99
History and the Christ of Faith, The Christ of—Rev. Simon FitzSimons 535, 693
Hospitals, Ancient Scottish—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B... 597
India and Its Consequences, Anarchism in—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P..... 507
Irish Foundress, An—R. F. O'Connor..... 645
Is Mars Inhabited?—Rev. William F. Rigge, S. J..... 682
Italian Unity, Fifty Years of—John J. O'Shea..... 385
John Bale's Vocation—M. A. Dunne..... 1
Kelly, Rev. Bernard W. Missionary Life in England in Later Penal Times 718
Last Empress of the French, The—R. F. O'Connor..... 422
Lloyd, M. Dante as a Preacher and Teacher of Righteousness. 54
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Anarchism in India and Its Consequences 507
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. England and the Sultan... 45
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. The Suppression of the Templars an Expediency..... 264
Mars Inhabited? Is—Rev. William F. Rigge, S. J..... 682
Mathematicians, Clergymen—James J. Walsh, Ph. D., M. D... 577
Miracle Plays, The Blessed Virgin in the York Cycle of—Rev. Francis O'Neill, O. P..... 439
Missionary Life in England in the Later Penal Times—Rev. Bernard W. Kelly..... 718

PAGE.

Murphy, C. S. Sp., Very Rev. John T. The Fight for the Schools in England and Some of Its Lessons..... 71
Murphy, C. S. Sp., Very Rev. John T. The Neo-Paganism Professed in American Universities..... 667
Nature of Sacrifice, The—Dom Benedict Steuart, O. S. B..... 303
Neo-Paganism Professed in American Universities, The—Very Rev. John T. Murphy, C. S. Sp..... 667
Newest Phases of the Eastern Question, The—Rev. Charles Warren Currier, Ph. D..... 81
O'Connor, R. F. An Irish Foundress..... 645
O'Connor, R. F. The Capture of Constantinople..... 125
O'Connor, R. F. The Last Empress of the French..... 422
O'Neill, O. P., Rev. Francis. The Blessed Virgin in the York Cycle of Miracle Plays..... 439
On the Revelations of St. Bridget—Darley Dale..... 224
O'Shea, John J. Fifty Years of Italian Unity..... 385
O'Shea, John J. Some Great Red Spots in Paris..... 633
O'Shea, John J. The Goddess of Reason "in Loco Parentis".. 61
Oxford Movement, The Sources and Destiny of the—Francis W. Grey, Litt. D..... 486
Paris, Some Great Red Spots in—John J. O'Shea..... 633
Pioneer Scottish Seminary, The—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B. 215
Pius VII. and the French Revolution—Donat Sampson..19, 235, 456
Poets: A Study in Opttimism, The Eschatology of the—M. A. Dunne 407, 617
Power, The Spiritual and the Temporal—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J. 9
Pragmatism—Rev. Ignatius W. Cox, S. J..... 139
Reformation? What Happened at the—James J. Walsh, Ph. D., M. D..... 193
Revelations of St. Bridget, On the—Darley Dale..... 224
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. John. The Spiritual and the Temporal Power 9
Rigge, S. J., Rev. William F. Is Mars Inhabited?..... 682
Sacramental Confession, H. C. Lea on St. Jerome and—Rev. John E. Graham..... 319
Sacrifice, The Nature of—Dom Benedict Steuart, O. S. B..... 303
St. Bridget, On the Revelations of—Darley Dale..... 224
Sampson, Donat. Pius VII. and the French Revolution..19, 235, 456
Schools in England and Some of Its Lessons, The Fight for the —Very Rev. John T. Murphy, C. S. Sp..... 71
Scottish Hospitals, Ancient—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B... 597
Scottish Seminary, The Pioneer—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B. 215
Situation in Spain, The—Rev. Charles Warren Currier, Ph. D. 522

PAGE.
Some Great Red Spots in Paris—John J. O'Shea..... 633
Sources and Destiny of the Oxford Movement, The—Francis W. Grey, Litt. D..... 486
Spain, The Situation in—Rev. Charles Warren Currier, Ph. D. 522
Spiritual and the Temporal Power, The—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J..... 9
State, Church and—Rev. M. M. Hassett.....112, 283
Steuart, O. S. B., Dom Benedict. The Nature of Sacrifice.....303
Sultan, England and the—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.... 45
Suppression of the Templars an Expediency, The—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P..... 264
Templars an Expediency, The Suppression of the—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P..... 264
Temporal Power, The Spiritual and the—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J..... 9
Universities, The Neo-Paganism Professed in American—Very Rev. John T. Murphy, C. S. Sp..... 667
Walsh, Ph. D., M. D., James J. What Happened at the Reformation?..... 193
Walsh, Ph. D., M. D., James J. Clergymen Mathematicians... 577
What Happened at the Reformation?—James J. Walsh, Ph. D., M. D..... 193

BOOKS REVIEWED.

Albrecht Durer—Weber..... 727
Alcuin Club Collections..... 182
And the Word Was Made Flesh—Ephraim..... 574
Anselm's Theory of the Atonement—Foley..... 190
Art et Apologetique—Sertillanges..... 178
Assemblees du Clerge et le Protestantisme, Les—Bourlon..... 179
Barbey d'Aurevilly..... 737
Bibliophorosdecurrentis Literaturae—Schmitt..... 177
Bienheureuse mere Barat, Le—de Grandmaison..... 576
Biographies of English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century—Kirk..... 379
Bishop de Mazenod—Baffie..... 756
Bouddhisme—de la Powletin..... 736
Boy-Savers' Guide, The—Quinn..... 187
Breviarium Romanum..... 738
Carmina—Daly..... 557
Casuist, The..... 192

PAGE.
Catechism in Examples, The—Chisholm.....188, 561
Catholic Church, The—Baudrillart..... 186
Catholic Encyclopedia 370, 735
Catholic Who's Who for 1909, The..... 536
Catholicity in Philadelphia—Kirlin..... 558
Comite de Salut Public, Le—Navarre..... 191
Compendium of Catechetical Instruction, A—Hagan.....191, 737
Dangers of the Day—Vaughan..... 189
Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England, The—Ward..... 378
Dedicace des Eglises, La—Baudot..... 179
Der Tabernakel—Raible 727
Die Briefe des Apostets—Belser..... 727
Die Menschenopfer der Alten Hebraer—Mader..... 755
Doctrine de l'Islam, La—Carra de Vaux..... 737
Drei Deutsche Minoriten—Franz..... 737
Early History of the Christian Church, The—Duchesne..... 567
Electress Sophia and the Hanoverian Succession, The—Ward.. 737
Elizabethan Religious Settlement, The—Birt..... 185
Epitome ex Editione Vaticana Gradualis Romani—Mathias.... 384
Erasme et Luther—Humbert..... 745
Eucharistie und Buszsakrament—Rauschen..... 733
Faith of Catholics, The—Berington and Kirk..... 740
Four-Square—Rickaby 190
Glories of Lourdes, The—Rousseil..... 753
Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The—Charles 184
Handbook of Canon Law—Lanslots..... 376
Helladian Vistas—Quinn 178
Henry Charles Lea's Historical Writings—Baumgarten..... 180
Histoire de la Foundation de l'Eglise—Dufourcq..... 175
Histoire de l'Inquisition en France—de Cauzons..... 172
Histoire des Dogmes—Tixeront..... 560
Histoire du Canon de l'Ancien Testament—Jugie..... 563
Histoire du Catholicisme en Angleterre—Planque..... 175
Historical Notes on English Catholic Missions—Kelly..... 571
History of the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ, The—Groenings 570
Holy Sacrifice and Its Ceremonies, The—Nieuwborn..... 573
Jansenisme, Le—Paquier..... 177
Law of the Church and Grave, The—Scanlan..... 564
Leibniz—Baruzi 374
Letters on Christian Doctrine—de Zulueta..... 380
Lettres sur les Etudes Ecclesiastiques—Mignot..... 176
L'Evolution Psychique de l'Enfant—Bouquet..... 384

PAGE.
Life and Times of Bishop Challoner, The—Burton..... 727
Life of St. Melania, The—Rampolla..... 377
Livre d'Amost, Le—Touzard..... 173
Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary, The—Beissel..... 570
Medicina Pastoralis—Antonelli 564
Memoirs of Scottish Catholics—Leith..... 732
Missale Romanum 737
Modernistes, Les—Maumus..... 171
Morale Scientifique—Grasset 752
New Series of Homilies—Bonomelli..... 565
Outlines of General History—Renouf..... 742
Path Which Led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church, The—Burnett 569
Petite Histoire de l'Eglise—Lerette..... 751
Philosophia Moralis ad Mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis—de Bie. 173
Private Retreat for Religious, A—Giermann..... 575
Question Sociale, La—Lecoq..... 171
Regesta Pontificum Romanorum—Kehr..... 373
Religion des Primitifs, La—Le Roy..... 372
Revival of Scholastic Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century, The —Perrier 375
Round the World.....572, 742
Rules of Life for the Pastor of Souls—Slater..... 576
San Celestino—Ayscough 741
Science et Religion—Series..... 174
Science of Ethics, The—Cronin..... 562
Selected Sermons—Hughes 371
Sermons on Modern Spiritism—Miller..... 573
Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology—Schecter..... 167
Springs of Helicon, The—Mackail..... 573
Studie Richerche 559
Sunday School Director's Guide to Success, The—Sloan..... 192
Theologie Scholastique, La—Ligeard..... 382
Thesaurus Dictionary of the English Language, A—March.... 166
Thoughts of the Heart—Northcote..... 381
Travail Sociologique, Le—Meline..... 171
Travail et Folie—Marie et Martial..... 382
Viae Vitae of St. Benedict, The—Hayes..... 383
Vie et la Legende de Saint Gwennole, La—Allier..... 727
Virtues and Spiritual Counsels of Father Noailles—Baffie..... 169
Wanderings in the Roman Compagna—Lanciani..... 739
We Preach Christ Crucified—Lucas..... 572
White Sister, The—Crawford..... 574
William Cardinal Allen—Camm..... 170

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXIV.—JANUARY, 1909—No. 133.

JOHN BALE'S VOCATION.

A SIDE-LIGHT ON REFORMATION DAYS IN IRELAND.

MEN rarely forecast the precise ground upon which their own fame will stand. Milton believed his immortality to lie in the now neglected pages of "Paradise Regained;" Newton fancied that the world would profit as much by the theology of his old age as by the science of his prime, flattering himself that he had cast as strong a light upon the "Prophecies of Daniel" as upon the natives of light itself. Could Frederick the Great have chosen his own laurels, he would now be crowned, not as a Prussian conqueror, but as a French classic.

Destiny plays her game of cross-purposes as whimsically with the minor mortals as with the major immortals. If erudite old John Bale, lying on his deathbed in the year of grace 1563, had been called upon to give a reason for the high repute in which he sincerely believed posterity would hold him, he might have paused over the patient research evinced in his laborious Latin record of the "Illustrious Writers of Great Britain," for is not learning, however profound, merely the adpoted child of man's mind, while the inventions of genius are his own progeny? He might have hesitated over his precious anti-Popery polemics, for since Popery itself was languishing unto death, might not those valuable treatises lose their vitality with the adversary's dissolution? He might have deliberated over his personal righteousness, for although his own pen testifies to his comfortable conviction that he had been a shining light to the Lord's

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1909, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

people and a scorching fire to the Lord's enemies, is it not written that the just man is taken away and none are mindful of him? But he would have rested his glance with modest satisfaction on those admirable productions of his own brain, the moralities and miracle-plays whereby, had time and circumstances been propitious, he might have converted to the Gospel Truth a whole nation of superstitious savages. Yes, he would have confessed, for John Bale was a candid man; his humble belief that future generations would find intellectual delight and spiritual edification in the "Comedy of John the Baptist," "The Tragedy of God's Promises" and the great historical drama of "King John," enacted with pious applause at the godly court of his own royal pupil, the young Edward VI.

Never, assuredly, would the dying reformer have suspected that a little autobiographical fragment, almost forgotten by its author, would more vividly touch the interest of the twentieth century than all the spoils of his learning or the arsenal of his controversy. This curious little volume, brought out in the orthodox city of Geneva, bears the following superscription: "Ye Vocacyionn of John Bale to ye Bishopryk of Ossorie, in Ireland, his persecuciones in ye same, and finalle delyveraunce therefrom." As a defiance to the Anti-Christ of the Tiber it is, moreover, set forth on the title-page that this book is "imprinted in Rome, before ye Castelle of S. Angelle, at ye seyne of S. Peter." This exact localizing of publication must be charitably accepted as an allegory, inasmuch as it would be rash to suppose that so ardent a champion of truth could have been vain enough or modern enough to press a picturesque lie into the service of a title page. This naive little exposition of John Bale's peculiar mission, fluctuating hopes, blind prejudices, inveterate hatreds and utter failure is one of the curiosities of literature. It was becoming daily rarer when its reprint in the "Harleian Miscellany" rescued it from extinction and preserved it among the quaint little genre pictures of history.

Grim John Bale was a sturdy Suffolk man, born near the little town of Cove, in 1495. Like most of the early so-called reformers, he received from the charity of the Church the weapons he afterwards used against her. A hardy peasant lad, he found a gratuitous education with the friars whom he afterwards maligned and persecuted. They perceived him to be a youth of parts and piety and carried him, at their own cost, through all the higher courses of their curriculum. His frequent boasts in later life as to the purity of his Latin and the mastery of his dialectics form his only recorded testimonial of gratitude. The good monks welcomed him into their number and he became a fervent Carmelite Friar of Ipswich. But the characteristic vanity and self-sufficiency of which his little auto-

biography is one perpetual disclosure, led him first to seek prominence and next to secure notoriety. It is not surprising that he became a conspicuous expounder of the "new doctrines," cast off his religious obedience and his monk's frock, violated his solemn vows and married, posed as a martyr and fled to the Continent. We might suppose that as Henry VIII. was himself the Joshua leading his people into the Promised Land of liberty and plenty, Bale could have stayed at home and claimed his share in the general enfranchisement from the Counsels and in the portioning of monastic spoils. But for once he showed his wisdom in keeping the salt sea and several dykes between himself and the founder of the new faith. It was impossible to predict from day to day upon whom might fall the shadow of royal displeasure, and under the Tudors such shadows had a trick of materializing into ponderous substance. The mixture of the old and new creeds required a nicety in theological cooks as exquisite as the blending of ingredients in a Spanish omelette, where the presence of garlic is to be detected only by the perception that its absence would leave the whole compound insipid.

Holland and Flanders gave Bale hospitality in his first exile, and in Amsterdam his religious belief assumed a certain Dutch solidity conspicuously lacking in the Protestantism of England. In fact, the King kept consciences and dogmas at home in such continual agitation that they had no time to cool into consistency. Henry's death came as a mercy of Providence to Protestants and Catholics alike. When Bale learned for a certainty that by the fall of the Supreme Head of his church in England his own more precious head would be safe on his shoulders, he gladly returned to the fair land he had reluctantly abandoned. His reputation for zeal and learning established him so favorably at the court of the boy King that he was numbered among the royal tutors. But his Protestantism, commendable for its ferocity, was objectionable for its rigor and proved inconvenient to the ministers, who wished to manipulate in their own interest the feeble King and his distracted realm. It seemed advisable to move the intractable extremist farther away under the honorable pretext of moving him higher up.

At the time of this unwelcome promotion Bale was enjoying the rich benefice of Bishopstoke, in the most inviting region of fertile Hampshire, a few miles from Southampton, on the way to London. Truly did it appear to John that the Lord had led him into green pastures and that nothing was wanting to him. Many a time, no doubt, he thanked a benign Providence that in bringing away from the Low Countries their pure faith and seemly manners, he had left behind forever their narrow streets, sandy dunes, murky fogs and uncouth tongues. With his beloved wife and family, treasured

books and prolific pen, he felt that his lines had fallen in pleasant places and suffered the fires of controversy to burn low. So was it with him when, lo, a voice came calling him to do battle against the Scarlet Abomination. John's vocation came and took him by the throat, and, alas, it was a vocation to Ireland. Yea, to wrestle with the grewsome dragon of Popery, and if so it might be, slay it in its most sheltered lair. There is no reason to doubt honest John's assurance that it was with reluctance he accepted the See of Ossory, which the King and Council then at Southampton had thrust upon him as a reward. Around the episcopal dignity still shone in England something of feudal splendor, but Bale shrewdly surmised that in the semi-barbarous isle across the channel if honors were easy, living was hard.

The veteran captain received his unwelcome call to the new apostolate on the feast of Our Lady's Assumption, 1552, he being then in his fifty-eighth year. The King parted with him affectionately; the royal Ministers instructed him in the political bearings of his mission, furnishing him with discouraging hints as to the civil and religious state of the land he was going to evangelize. Henry's reformed doctrines had never been clearly understood in Ireland; not indeed from lack of energy in the royal methods of instruction, but rather because the new catechism was chiefly contained in acts of Parliament, which formed such problems in cancellation that it was impossible to tell in the solution which factor remained intact. The catechists whose teaching bore the force of unanswerable logic were the English troops. Plundered churches, ruined monasteries, slaughtered herds and burning cabins formed a dogmatic system at once obvious and irrefutable. Brown in Dublin and Goodacre in Armagh were working hard in favor of the new order. It was hoped that with the aid of Bale at Ossory they would be able to rid Ireland forever of Popery and its attendant superstitions.

With no comprehension of the difficulties before him and without either wisdom to grasp or tact to avoid them, Bale, like many of his countrymen before and since, sailed for a land which he held in profound contempt, but which reserved a lesson for his instruction. Upon his arrival he found, to his horror, that the "communion service" was still performed in Waterford Cathedral "in the old idolatrous manner," and that the people, to use his own forcible phrases, "*wawled* over their dead with prodigious howlings and putterings, as though souls had not been quieted in Christ!" He was everywhere, he says, scandalized at their "heathenish behayviours!" He left Waterford with the melancholy conviction that the incumbent of that see, though professing the pure interpretation of the Word, was "no true Bishop of Christ," a title to which, judg-

ing from his memoirs, he alone among the British hierarchy could pretend. He further notes his suspicion that his host, the Mayor of the city, "was no true subject of King Edward." Altogether the state of affairs in Waterford appalled the conscientious stranger and gave him his first premonition of coming peril.

From this town, which he left under the ban of heaven, the Bishop-elect proceeded to Dublin, where his consecration was to take place. The Chancellor, Sir Thomas Cusack, welcomed him with every mark of honor, and his old friend Goodacre, the new Archbishop of Armagh, cheered his heart by "comfortable speech." The feast of Our Lady's Purification had been set as the day for the ceremony. The very date was an irritation; it seemed a plain concession to Popish prejudice. Besides, Brown, the consecrating prelate, with the Bishops of Down and Kildare as assistants, proposed to conduct the function according to the ancient, that is, the Roman ritual. Bale felt that the time had come for him to speak out. He swore that he would turn back at the altar steps unless the pure and simple forms of the new Church were maintained in all their severity. As it was evident that the consecration of a Bishop could not be carried on without a Bishop to be consecrated, his companions of necessity yielded. The function was performed with all the solemnity consistent with a general ignorance of the new ritual on the part of all engaged in it. When the moment of Communion came, Bale perceived with dismay a host "in the form of a Roman wafer." He stopped the ceremony at once and announced in a voice of thunder that not another step would he take until the idolatrous symbol was removed and common table bread substituted. All, he says, "were struck with consternation at his terrific aspect and resounding voice," and the rite was hastily concluded.

He gloried in this first great triumph without foreseeing that it was to be his last. Archbishop Brown, though himself a stentorian denouncer of Popery, was disgusted with his rough guest. Archbishop Goodacre, though Bale's best and wisest friend, was grieved by the violence of his language. But John went on his way rejoicing. Of Archbishop Brown he formed a most unflattering estimate, which later experience rendered still more unfavorable. Of his right reverend host he finally bequeathed this silhouette, in which it must be remembered the charcoal was supplied by Brown's political enemies: "I thought nothing less at that time than to pour out the precious pearls of the Gospel afore so brockish a swine he was. And as touching learning, whereof he much boasted in his cups, I know none in which he is exercised save that of vice." Bale was not so obtuse as to be blind to the fact that his Dublin entertainers were more anxious to see him set out for his see than he was to take

possession of it. Accordingly, with his wife and family he journeyed by easy stages to Kilkenny.

To his great mortification he found but a cold reception in the city of Strongbow, whither his fiery fame had preceded him. The ancient Cathedral of St. Canice or St. Kenny's, a magnificent monument of the faith of the Middle Ages, was the pride of clergy and people. Bale observed with anger the universal reluctance to see this venerable edifice employed for any other form of worship than that by which it had been hallowed for centuries. He declaimed against such perversity; the sacred walls resounded with vituperations of people and clergy. Lest what was thundered in English might be lost, he was careful to give the clerics the benefit of his opinion in Latin, and for the entire security of the people caused each compliment to be finally translated into Irish. He was thus satisfied that by means of the three languages all had come to know precisely what he thought of them. On his own testimony he bestirred himself in season and out of season to place before them the idolatry of their worship, the stupidity of their minds, the brutality of their manners, the depravity of their morals and the certainty of their eternal perdition.

He then began with delightful simplicity to conjecture that it was Satan only who enkindled in these misguided people an unaccountable and preternatural hatred of him, their lawful Bishop and appointed instructor. Through the machinations of the evil spirit he became, he honestly avows, an object of general abhorrence. And yet even after this date his memoirs exhibit amusing fluctuations of dismay and self-conplacency. Sometimes he shuddered to think that he was equally dreaded and despised; at other times he transcribed proofs of the love and esteem of his people. Sometimes he pronounced their abominations ineradicable, and again he thanked God that he was beginning to reap an abundant harvest of souls.

But in the month of July came tidings of dire import for the godly Bishop of Ossory. Edward was dead and Mary Tudor was Queen of England. Lord Mountgarret and the chief officials of Kilkenny hastened to the Cathedral and insisted on the celebration of a Mass according to the Roman rite. The clergy complied, under the very eyes of the fuming and helpless Anglican Bishop. A fleeting ray of hope pierced the gloom during Lady Jane Gray's brief usurpation, but that light went out and evil days fell upon the righteous ones of the Lord.

On the 20th of August, to the Bishop's unspeakable anguish, Kilkenny celebrated Queen Mary's accession. There were, he records with disgust, such rejoicings as had never before been witnessed by the eye of man. "They proclaimed her with the greatest

solemnity that could be devised of processions, musters and disguisings; what ado I had that day about wearing the cope, crosier and mitre it were too much to write." The staunch old reformer stoutly declared that, let who would be King, Queen or Emperor, he would take no part in Popish mummeries nor would a Popish trapping be seen on his orthodox back. "But," he narrates, "they did find a way to carry out their papistical fantasies, for in the meantime had the other prelates got two disguised priests, one to bear the mitre before me and another the crosier, making thereby three pageants instead of one."

But this was not all. It came to his ears that his enemies were "bruiting a humor" that he would soon retract in his pulpit the anti-Popery sermons no longer acceptable to the ruling powers and begin to tread in the paths of the ancient observance. This was indeed a cruel slander. On Thursday, August 24, feast of St. Bartholomew, he mounted the pulpit with honorable hardihood and on the text "I am not ashamed of the Gospel" he held forth in his last Irish sermon. It was long; it was both exhausting and exhaustive. It covered the whole question between Rome and England and reviewed his whole episcopate of six months. It anathematized clergy and people and consigned Pope and Cardinals to endless detention in that secure abode whose existence Bale's modern followers deny. This sermon did not produce the humiliation and dismay he had expected; rather was there such an ebullition of popular indignation that he took counsel of discretion and hurried away to his country seat at Holiness Court on the following day.

"As soon as the townspeople knew I had gone to the country," he relates, "they restored in my (?) Cathedral the whole heap of the superstitions of the Bishop of Rome. They rang all the bells in that Cathedral, in the minster, and in the parish churches. They flung up their caps to the battlements of the great temple with smilings and laughings most dissolutely, the justice himself being therewith offended. They brought forth their copes, candlesticks, holy water stocks, crosses and censers; they mustered forth in general processions most gorgeously all the town over with Sancta Maria, Ora pro nobis, and the rest of the Latin litanies. They chattered it, they chaunted it with great noise and devotion. They banqueted all the day after my going, because they were delivered from the grace of God into a warm sun!"

Hitherto the stirring drama of Master John Bale's vocation to Ireland had been a farce rather than a comedy. Now it became a real tragedy. One of the "Romish fantasies" against which he set his face was the observance of Our Lady's festival days. The feast of her Nativity, September 8, was especially dear to the people. Its

desecration was considered not only irreligious, but ill-omened. For that very reason Bale determined that on that day his household should go forth to the hay-making. "Five of my household," he tells us, "went out to make hay. . . . And as they were come to the meadow cruel murderers to the number of a score leaped out of their lurking bushes and cowardly slew them. They then feloniously robbed me of all my horses, to the number of seven, driving them before them." But that this shocking outrage was chargeable neither to the townsfolk nor to the peasantry is proved by Bale's own admission as to the people's prompt and generous expedition to his rescue. He relates it with real gratitude and a touch of his usual vanity. The crime was undoubtedly the work of that band of lawless marauders sheltered by the great nobles of whom Bale himself gives elsewhere a graphic account. The unsettled state of the country gave them immunity. Bale's provision of horses supplied the temptation, while the general aversion in which he was held no doubt guided their choice.

The sky was black and darker clouds were gathering. To prolong his apostolate until it would be crowned by martyrdom was no part of John Bale's vocation to Ireland. He had come to Kilkenny with little ceremony; he left it with less. Disguised at night, and with only his wife as companion, he shipped to Leighton Castle; thence, aided by the English, who were eager to be rid of so dangerous an ally, he hurried to Dublin. His old grudge against Archbishop Brown was embittered by that prelate's resolution to give him neither succor nor hospitality. "As the epicurous Archbishop had knowledge of my being there, he made boast upon his ale-bench, with cup in hand, *as I heard the tale told,* that for no man's pleasure would he let me preach in his city. But this needed not! He had then become of a dissembling proselite, a most pernicious Papist."

After an anxious delay of some weeks in the unfriendly city of Dublin, poor Bale was able at last to watch a merciful sea broadening between him and the accursed shore which he never touched again. But, alas, a final and malicious practical joke of his enemies prolonged his misery for a month more. The little merchantman which had taken him as a passenger was bound for Scotland. She was boarded by a Flemish man-of-war hovering on the coast, and Bale was seized, put in irons and carried off as a captive, while the craft from which he had been dragged was permitted to pursue her way unmolested. Time and the peculiar treatment to which he was subjected opened the heart of the mystery. The Irish pilot, whom Bale suspected to be in "a complot with his enemies," had confidentially apprised the Flemish commander that the suspicious look-

ing character, of whom he gave an exact description, was a Frenchman in disguise carrying a vast sum in gold, to be employed in his own country's war against Spain and Flanders!

In vain the distracted traveler assured his stolid captors that he was no Frenchman, carried no gold and had no designs against Flanders, a country which he sincerely loved and honored. In vain he gave his name, explained his position, related his sorrows. It was all to no purpose. The Flemings either doubted him or affected to do so. Sometimes the stranger was harshly dealt with; at others he was treated with a certain distrustful indulgence. Only when the leader was convinced that no ransom would be forthcoming did he land his captive in Flanders, restoring such goods as the sailors had taken for booty.

Through Flanders the balked apostle made his way to Germany, in which country he found spiritual comfort and temporal assistance. He settled in Geneva, and neither hoped nor desired to return to Great Britain, where he had found his cake "dough on both sides." But Elizabeth succeeded to the throne and rejoiced the right thinking by her mighty upholding of the truth and her powerful dealing with the ungodly. Old Bale thought it best to gather up his goods and go home. He was well received by the Queen, was appointed Prebend of Canterbury and thenceforth basked in the royal favor until the day of his death. The nightmare of his vocation to Ireland had passed away, and "his persecuciones in ye same." He had been granted "finalle delyveraunce therefrom."

M. A. Dunne.

Chicago, Ill.

THE SPIRITUAL AND THE TEMPORAL POWER.

III.

LEGAL THEORIES ON THE TWO POWERS.

IT WAS inevitable during the contests between the Papal and the imperial sovereignty that theories should arise as to their interrelation, and an extremest view for the Papal claim was, at least in suggestion, put forth by John of Salisbury. The view was that the keys given to Peter bestowed upon the Holy See spiritual and temporal jurisdiction over the whole of Christendom, so that Kings ruled only as delegates or ministers of the Pontiff. This was the fullest extension of the doctrine known as that of the Two Swords. *Hunc gladium de manu ecclesiae accipit princeps,*

cum ipsa tamen gladium sanguinis omnino non habeat. Est ergo princeps Sacerdotii minister.[1] The writer, with a limited scope, was speaking of the coercive power on behalf of spiritual interests in the State, but these words were easily extended by others to a wider sphere. St. Thomas of Canterbury, who also had before him the preservation of ecclesiastical liberties from royal encroachment, took up a like strain in his letters of remonstrance addressed to Henry I., and appealing to the text, "Thou art Peter," he made the inference, "It is certain Kings receive their power from the Church," and that they should try to obstruct the juridical acts of the Bishops he regarded as quite an inversion of right order. *Non habetis episcopis praecipere absolvere aliquem vel excomunicare; judicare de ecclesiis vel decimis; interdicere episcopis ne tractent causas de transgressione fidei vel juramenti; et multa alia hujusmodi quae scripta sunt inter consuetudines vestras quas dicitis avitas.*[2]

Here was at least a possibility offered for an ampler extension of the idea that Kings should be administers of Popes. The full-fledged theory of a universal supremacy sprang from the theologians Henry of Segusia, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Augustinus Triumphus and Alvarez Pelagius, writers of the fourteenth century, who were copied later by Bozio. To this extreme right was opposed an extreme left—Ockam, Marsilio of Padua, and his collaborator, John of Jaudan, often confounded with John of Ghent, so that the writings of the two are not now respectively distinguishable. When the opposition became strongest it substituted Aristotle's politics for canon law and for St. Augustine's "Civitas Dei," a democratic basis for Church authority, and it set nationality above Catholicity. There was some anticipation of the maxim which Abraham Lincoln propounded when he said: "No man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent." The large deference shown in the early Church to popular approval of candidates for clerical office had nothing to say to the intrinsic powers of priestly orders and of jurisdiction, which were a Christian institution depending for their validity on the Founder's authority. Thus with careful restrictions it was possible in primitive ages of the Church to make application of the old dictum: *Quod omnibus tangit, ab omnibus approbetur.* Approval is not the same as grant of power. But the school of Ockam and Marsilio claimed much more than this for their popular and *quasi* parliamentary control over the Popes.

The University of Paris was seething with the new liberalism in theological opinions when D'Ailly was there as a young student, imbibing errors which he afterwards handed on to Gerson and pro-

[1] Policraticus, IV., 3.

[2] *Cf.* S. Bernard, "De Consider," IV., 3, Ep. 256.

pounded in the Council of Constance. It is true that his doctrine of superiority of the General Council to the Pope was delivered at a time when the legitimate Pope was doubtful and when the seventy years of captivity at Avignon were being followed by forty years of schism, all tending to lower the previous ideas entertained upon the subject of Papal supremacy.[3]

Another lowering influence is said to have been the study of Roman law, which is reported to have kindled in some breasts a dangerous enthusiasm for a return to imperialism conceived on the grand old lines of Roman Cæsarism. It has been shown that this study was not a novelty; that it did not start from a sudden discovery at Anagni of the previously lost pandects; that it had not to await the rise of the legalist university at Bologna before it became an influence. At the University of Paris, which was meant to be theological[4] rather than legal, Honorius III. and Innocent IV. put restrictions on the study of the civil code. Denifle in his "History of the Mediæval Universities" says that the limit here placed was not a broad policy of repression, but only an exceptional precaution which allowed of dispensations in desirable cases; for example, in favor of clerics holding only *simplices curas animarum* Gregory IX. granted exemption. Before the time of the inculpated Honorius III. (1216) a Council of Clermont (1130), which was followed by another at Rheims (1131), made provision against the distractions occasioned to the clergy by the study of law and medicine, and not only by the study, but also by the subsequent practice with a view to lucre. The decrees last mentioned affected all clerks regular and all monks who had taken their vows.[5] A like precaution was adapted by a council held in London in 1268. It appears, then, that there were reasons for restriction quite other than the mere rivalry of civil law to canon law or to the theology of Papal claims. Apart from other connections, the Justinian code might have done little to make students disloyal to the Sovereign Pontiff, especially as in it

[3] A Pope said: Nullas invites et non petentibus ordinetur.

[4] John of Salisbury, Ep. 138, observed that the study of the law did not contribute to the spirit of compunction. Roger Bacon complained that the clever students were drawn from theology to law, and thereby secularized.

[5] Under Alexander III., 1176, the third Lateran Council (Canon 12) limited clerical pleaders to the defense of their own Church or of needy persons, who could offer no temptation to cupidity. A council of Paris, 1212, distinguished between beneficed and non-beneficed clergy, allowing the latter to take moderate remuneration for their advocacy: "ne immoderata salaria exigere praesumant." Greater strictness appeared in the decretals of Gregory IX., who made the prohibition absolute, "excepta defensione orphanorum et viduarum," Libr., III., Tit. 50. Causes of life and limb were declared unsuitable, as appears in the rule of Boniface VIII., "nec criminalium causarum potest quisquam clericus judex fieri, nec judex qui fuit in clericum coöptari." See Thomassinus, Part I., Liv. I., c. 69.

was embodied the principle of Church authority: *Maxima quidem in hominibus sunt dona Dei, a suprema collata clementia, sacerdotium et imperium.* There is, furthermore, a conservatism in law which on the whole would make for the preservation of the Church's rights such as had been established before the calamities of the fourteenth century caused the obscuration of principles in regard to the Papal position.

As the disputes continued and showed themselves in practical life[6] it became urgent to find some technical terms which would give precision to the title whereby the Popes claimed to control secular princes. Three phrases especially were found: (1) First, there was the *potestas directa* as it appeared in the teaching already described of Augustinus Triumphus and others.[7] (2) There was the *potestas directiva,* a term which Fénelon attributes to Gerson and thus formulates in clear language: *Haec non juridica et civilis est, sed directiva tantum et ordinativa potestas, quam approbat Gersonius.*[8] It might seem that a directive power would be far too little to account for the facts of history, but Fénelon makes up the deficiency by explaining how princes in a Christian State entered upon office, sometimes with an oath to that effect and sometimes on the tacitly understood condition to rule as Christian sovereigns, in subjection to the Church's canons and to her living Bishops, and that if they broke the engagement, it belonged to the Pope especially to declare the breach and to proclaim their authority forfeited. Such a right to arbitrate or to give a decision as in case of conscience, when vested in the prince of pastors, might suffice to meet all needs. *Potestas directiva in eo consistit quod Papa, utpote princeps pastorum, utpote praecipuus in majoribus moralis disciplinae causis ecclesiae director et doctor, de servando fidelitatis sacramento populum consulentem edocere teneatur.*[9] In this way the various deposi-

---

[6] In England Grosseteste affords us a good illustration. By anti-Papalists he is often claimed as notably on their side, for he resisted some Papal presentations and taxations. He did so where he thought it right, but zeal for pure religion under the Pope's supreme authority was his most remarkable characteristic. He set wide apart the Bishop's proper office in spiritual and his participation in the judicial and magisterial work of the State; for himself he rejected the proffered compliment that he possessed "a universality of legal knowledge." From Gregory IX. he received authorization to take proceedings against ecclesiastics who acted as justiciaries or as sheriffs. He told a prelate that even if this dignitary's secular business were removed, his Church duties would still be too large for him.

[7] These same extremists, with Egedius of Rome, denied that pagan peoples had a right to their territory, or that the Pope could grant it away to Christians.

[8] Dissert. De Auctoritat. Sum. Pontif., cap. 39.

[9] *Id.*, cap. 27.

tions of princes by the Popes could be accounted for all the more easily when, as in some instances, States had by special stipulation made themselves more or less feudatory dependents on the Papacy, instances of which were England,[10] Poland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Portugal and Naples. Then as regards the empire itself, insofar as in its spiritual institution it was a Papal creation, it owed a subjection to its Lord. With Fénelon's doctrine Bossuet substantially agreed, thus stating his own view as to the action of Pope Zachary in the substitution of Pepin for the *fainèant Childeric: Non factum est ut Pontifex regnum adimeret aut daret, sed ut declararet adimendum vel dandum ab iis quibus id juris competere judicaset.*[11] Here it appears why the *potestas directa* and the *potestas indirecta* are repudiated by Bossuet; he considers both as acts of jurisdiction exercised over subjects, and he does not regard the civil State as such to be even indirectly thus subject. (3) The third theory is that maintained by Bellarmine, who may claim to be one of its prominent representatives. It is the *potestas indirecta,* whereby the Pope, not having direct power over the temporal affairs of princes, can sometimes overrule them indirectly in the interests of spiritual concerns which are his and to which worldly concerns are subordinate. Thus of the Pope deposed a King, it would not be directly as he would depose a Bishop: *non eo modo quo deponit episcopos tanquam ordinarius judex.*[12] In the matter of some phrases Bossuet comes wonderfully near to a recent utterance of Leo XIII., he using *suprema et absoluta* where the Pontiff uses *maxima.* The words of the Pope are: *Deus humani generis gubernationem inter duas potestates partitus est, scilicet ecclesiasticam et civilem, alteram quidem divinis, alteram humanis rebus praepositam. Utraque est in suo genere maxima.*[13] The utterances of Leo, made at a time when Christendom was hopelessly divided, are necessarily more restricted and more cautious than were earlier utterances made by Popes when doctrine had not been analyzed into its precise parts and when actual, or, as it is said nowadays, "factual" concessions went further than what was the constitutional right for all Christian ages. In deference of the strong terms used by Boniface VIII., it is urged that substantially his language was but that of his predecessors, coming

[10] Much of the Papal interference in English affairs of the civil order in the reign of Henry III. clearly supposes the act of King John in putting the realm under the Pope.

[11] Defens. Declarat., Part II., 33-36.

[12] Bellarmine, De Rom. Pontif., v. 6. Bossuet contradicts him: "Reges et principes in temporalibus nulli ecclesiasticae potestati subjici, neque auctoritate clavium ecclesiae directe vel indirecte deponi." Defens. Declar., Part I., Lib. Sec. I., Cap. 16.

[13] Encyl. Immortale Dei, 1885. *Cf.* Bossuet, Defens. Cler. Gall., Part I., Lib. I., Sect. II., C. 37.

down from Gregory VII. through Innocent III. and the succeeding Popes who had specially to contend with the Emperors. Yet even then Popes, while they did not expressly lay down the theory of the indirect power, nevertheless from time to time signified that the State had a direct power of its own which could be controlled by the Pontiff only on the ground of its inference with higher interests of religion, not on the ground of mere political supremacy. Gregory VII. addressed Henry IV. as one whom God had established on the throne—*quem Deus in sumino rorum posuit culmine.*[14] Innocent III. observed that while his spiritual jurisdiction was unbounded (*nullis terminis coarctata*), his jurisdiction in things temporal was only *in multis.*[15] He called the Papal and the imperial powers distinct, yet so related that the Pope had great authority in civil affairs, but not the supreme authority as in spiritual—*in spiritualibus habet summam, in temporalibus magnam a Deo potestatem.*[16] To Philip the Fair Boniface signified that his own interference in French concerns of State was *ratione peccati,* because the King was sinning against God and His Church; otherwise the bull *Unam Sanctam* allowed that there were two powers, Church and State. The concession was not wholly negatived by the famous and ambiguous word *instituere* occurring in the clause, *spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem instituere habet et judicare.* Here is one of those catch phrases which theologian after theologian repeated. The passage as read in Hugo of St. Victor[17] ran thus: *Instituere ut sit,* where the addition *ut sit* seems to imply more than "instruction" or "guidance," and to suggest creation by the Pope. Egidius of Rome used this form: *Spiritualis potestas instituere habet terrenam potestatem; et si terrena potestas bona non fuerit, spiritualis eam potest judicare.*[18] This was copied by Alexander of Hales in his *Summa,* with the substitution of *constituere* for *instituere* (IV., X., 3, 21). Well versed in the theologians, Boniface took from them his phrase *instituere* and other phrases besides which have occasioned complaint.

As to the special word *instituere,* while its meaning seems not to be fully satisfied by the rendering "instruct," yet it may be referred to the right of the Church to approve, anoint and crown Kings after having used a moral influence to determine their elections. All these acts may be expressed by *instituere.* Indeed, it would have been absurd on the part of Boniface VIII. to pretend that the Popes by their own power simply established monarchies and monarchs as they founded bishoprics and furnished them with Bishops. In

[14] Lib. II., Ep. 31.
[15] Lib. II., Ep. 4.
[16] Lib. VIII., Ep. 190.
[17] De Sacrament., Lib. II., Part II., Cap. 4.
[18] De Eccles. Potest,, Lib. I., Cap. 3.

the catch phrases of theology and canon law, as they pass from mouth to mouth and from pen to pen, we may expect in some instances an extravagant usage avoided by the more careful. A flagrant instance of abuse occurred in the frequent repetition of the *tanta est vis confessionis,* taken from the *"De Vera et Falsa Poenitentia"* of the pseudo-Augustin and employed to enforce confession to laymen in defect of a priest. Hugo shows his sense of limitation to be put upon the phrase *instituere ut sit* by adding that the "spiritual power does not exist to do prejudice to the rights of the temporal," and that "the King or Emperor is head of the temporal government." Boniface VIII. also explained himself as not having intended to detract from the regal authority in its own distinct sphere so long as it abode within this sphere and made no encroachment on spiritual rights, in which case the King, of course, became like any other son of the Church, subject to its supreme jurisdiction. Bossuet says of the remarkable definition with which the *Unam Sanctam* ends that it is simply Catholic truth. *Hoc tantum habet definitio: "Subesse Romano Pontifici omnem creaturam declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."* This, observes Bossuet, is certain among Catholics when it is understood of the spiritual power,[19] and Boniface spoke of this spiritual power in its corrective right over the sins of a much sinning monarch whom no one can throughout defend[20]—Philip the Fair. The royal office instead of diminishing a King's liability to spiritual censures in one way, considerably increases their need. No doubt if Boniface had foreseen objections he would have toned down or stated more cautiously some of his propositions, but in the heat of strife language is apt to become strong, and even requires a certain strength. Furthermore, we should remember that Boniface included his historic *de facto* rights along with those which were simply *de jure offici.* It is not necessary that the Pope's actual rights should be exactly the same in every age; his position requires him to hold in check temporal princes when their conduct touches ecclesiastical immunities and prerogatives, but the requirements of such a position will allow of some alterations in shape to meet varying conditions of time. One of Boniface's predecessors clearly recognized that more might be contained in some validated custom than was found in the pure principle of jurisdiction. It was Alexander III. who in 1160 had written in reply to a question: *"Quod quaeris, si e civili judice, ante judicium vel post, ad nostram audientiam appellatio teneatur, tenet quidem in his quae sunt nostrae temporali jurisdic-*

[19] Defens. Declarat., Lib. III., Cap. 23.

[20] Philip wanted to lessen in his realm the exercise of civil functions by clerics and the amount of money that went to clerics. If this purpose was not wholly wrong, the means used to attain it were often violent.

tioni subjecta; in aliis vero, etsi de consuetudine ecclesiae tenet secundum juris rigorem credimus non tenere."[21]

There is, however one instance of an apparent contempt for temporal power by a great Pope which needs a word of explanation, but first a few preparatory remarks. St. Paul says that the law is set not for the just, but for the unjust, and certain fathers of the Church dwell on the fact that it is sin and the fall of mankind from Paradise that render necessary the restraint by human governors. The purely repressive side of government was what most struck some minds which paid little attention to its power of promoting good. The Stoics, with not a little truth, observed that civil laws were prohibitions for bad subjects, not stimulations for the good. To this day we have few laws that reward virtue. Gerson[22] said of the civil authority, "The efficient cause was sin, the final cause was peace." And by the side of this utterance we may place the analogical case of property, about which J. S. Mill said that "it did not owe its origin to those considerations of utility which plead for the maintenance of it when established; for enough is known from history to show that tribunals were established not to determine rights, but to repress violence and end quarrels. With this purpose in view they naturally enough gave legal effect to just occupancy. The preservation of peace, which was the original object of civil government, was thus attained."[23]

Spencer's theory of the negative function of government to prevent injustice is well known. Newman often dwells rather on the reproving than on the approving voice of conscience. Plato describes the various arts of life as means to supply human wants or deficiencies. With the law of physical nature contrasts human law as a restraining, repressive force. Here are examples of negative, depreciatory views.

We are prepared now to hear St. Gregory VII. assign the origin of civil government to the devil, for we know the limitation of the aspect from which he was regarding the institution. "Who is unaware," he wrote, "that Kings and rulers held their powers from those who, heedless of God and at the instigation of the devil, have assumed over their equals a domination prompted by cupidity and pride?"[24] As a matter of fact, many dynastics thus came into power; if afterwards they were legitimated, at least their beginnings were bad. Moreover, Gregory would have remembered the Scripture account of the Jewish Kings, how the people, as it were, forced the hand of God to anticipate His plan that the Jews might "have a

[21] Cap. 7, X., De Duabus II., 28.
[22] Sermo ad Reg. Franc. pro Justitia.
[23] Polit. Econom., Bk. II., Ch. I., n. 2.
[24] Lib. VIII., Eps. 20. an. 1080.

King like as the Gentiles"—too much like, for it tended to upset the idea of the theocracy. Much later the French legalist Bodin remarked that the origin of monarchy was not contract, but usurpation.[25] In various ways, therefore, the disparaging remark of Gregory VII. on the actual origin of civil governments, which were rarely quite just and often very unjust, is reconcilable with his orthodox acceptance of the New Testament teaching that kingly power is from God.

The sins of contemporary governments were also much before the mind of Boniface VIII. when, like Gregory, he spoke bitterly of the temporal estates, for he had seen a great deal of the ambitions and the rivalries between secular princes—conflicts between Genoa and Venice, between the Aragonese rulers of Sicily and the representatives of the house of Anjou, between Adolf of Nassau and a competitor with him for the German throne, between Edward I. of England and Philip of France, and again between Edward and the Scots. The Pope himself had to struggle at Rome against the rebellious Colonna family, as in France against the anti-Papal monarchy. Some writers take the view that Boniface VIII. by his high claims struck a blow at the temporal power from which the Papacy never recovered, though the final extinction was delayed till the conquest of King Victor Emmanuel. By the Reformation a condition of affairs was brought about quite incompatible with the mediæval conception of an allied Papacy and empire. It was the function of Luther and Zwingli, of Anglicans like Whitgift and Hooker to transfer to the State most of the prerogatives that had belonged in the Middle Ages to the Church. Or rather that had belonged in the Middle Ages to the Church. Or rather what happened was this: The limits of society were narrowed to the nation or territory, while its nature was more that of a State than of a Church. The mediæval mind conceived its universal Church-State, with power ultimately fixed in its spiritual head,[26] bounded by no territorial frontier; the Protestant mind placed all ecclesiastical authority below and subject to the control of the Godly prince.[27] Such Godly princes were Henry VIII. and Elizabeth and Cromwell. Certainly it is agreed that in shaking off the Papacy the reformed Churches took to themselves temporal masters, who did not mitigate the yoke of subjection and who provoked dissenters to rise against the new combination.

Hooker was a well-known defender of one Anglican theory about the national Church. He regarded Episcopacy as if not absolutely

---

[25] See Leckey, "History of European Rationalism," Vol. II., p. 218.

[26] This is not accurate without distinction.

[27] From "Gerson to Gdotius," Lecture III.

needful, yet recommendable by high antiquity and by successful experiences, and as a matter of agreement within the English nation he would have the civil and the religious government amalgamate in a Christian kingdom. "A Commonwealth is one way and a Church is another way defined, yet seeing that there is not any man of the Church of England but the same is also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any man is member of the Commonwealth who is not also of the Church of England, therefore as in a figure triangular the base doth differ from the sides thereof, and yet one and the same line is both a base and also side—a side simply, a base if it chance to be at the bottom and support the rest—so albeit properties and actions of one kind do cause the name of a Commonwealth, qualities and functions of another sort the name of a Church to be given to a multitude; yet one and the same multitude may be a such sort both, or is so with us, that no person appertaining to the one can be denied to be also of the other."[28]

Dean Stanley inherited from his master, Dr. Arnold, much of Hooker's scheme. Arnold, his biographer tells us, thought it superstition to suppose the Church ruled not by natural laws, but by a divinely appointed succession of priests; in the Christian people he disliked a distinction into lay and sacerdotal order. His ideal was not a sovereign Church acting through a State as through an inferior instrument for the Christianizing of the people, but an identification in a single Church-State. "The only perfect freedom," he said, "is where the Church and the State are both free and both one."[29] Dissenters strongly revolted from such an amalgamation. Their watchword, still repeated to-day, was that Church and State were institutions quite apart, and that the Church must accept no State money and tolerate no State interference in spiritual concerns. In the heat of the controversy about the present question of religion to be taught in schools we shall not understand the vehemence and the persistence of the dissenters unless we remember that from their religious as distinct from their worldly point of view their attitude is an inheritance from a keenly contentious past in English history, during which, as they boast, they suffered much hardship for their cause.

In his chapter on the secularization of politics Mr. Leckey takes the Crusades as marking out the time when dogmatic interests most domineered over the political and the social, so as to quell even national animosities and to put the State to that extreme test of earnestness, submission to have its finances ruined for a religious cause. "The statesmen of to-day," he adds, "set aside dogmatic interests from practical politics, which are quite secularized." The

[28] Ecclesiastical Polity, Bk. VIII., Chap. I.

[29] "Life and Letters," Vol. II., p. 376, ninth edition.

extension of the severance to our schools is natural. We who would avoid secularization as a calamity of the direst sort seek to stop the course of naturalistic development, in aid of which purpose we still look to the Pope to speak to us and to the civil rulers as one who has a right, whether statesmen admit it or not, to check governments when their action is injurious to the religion of Christ. For us that utility has not ceased which as serviceable to the Middle Ages has been so highly exalted by writers of very different schools, such as Milwan, Guizot, Hallam, Gregorovius and Leckey. For example, the last named says of the Papal State then about to fall before the Italian conquest: "No human pen can write its epitaph, for no imagination can adequately recognize its glories. In the eyes of those who estimate the greatness of a sovereignty not by the extent of its territory or the valor of its soldiers, but by the influence which it has exercised over mankind, the Papal government had no rival and can have no successor."[30]

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

PIUS VII. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

IV.

THE Church of France did not begin to enjoy peace and independence as soon as the Concordat was signed and ratified. Bonaparte had succeeded in concluding it in spite of the ill-will and opposition of the members of his government and of the strong Jacobin element still prevailing among the representatives of the people. He alone had seen clearly the necessity of reconciling France with the Holy See, though his proceedings show that he was guided by purely political motives, and was determined to maintain the Church as much as possible subordinate to the State and to use it as a means of spreading among the people the ideas of order and of submission to the government. But though the infidel members of his administration had been forced to yield to his strong will, they still sought to counteract, by every means in their power, his efforts to grant the Church even the small degree of liberty he was inclined to allow. One might even ask if this petty persecution may not have been tolerated to a certain degree by Bonaparte with a view to making the French clergy feel how completely it was still in his power, and that to him were owing whatever freedom it

[30] "History of Rationalism," Vol. II., p. 142, first edition.

possessed. The ecclesiastics who had found means to remain in France without taking the oath to the Civil Constitution, or who had returned from exile without the permission of the government, were no longer, it is true, liable to be condemned to death or to deportation to Cayenne, but they were still exposed to be treated as enemies of the State, for in several departments the prefects continued to arrest them and expel them from the country, as they had done under the Directory and had not ceased to do since the beginning of the Consulate. It was probably with the intention of openly manifesting his aversion to the First Consul's policy that Fouché, the Minister of Police, took care to give as much publicity as possible to these repressive measures.

Not only while Cardinal Consalvi was negotiating the Concordat, but even after it had been signed, the official *Moniteur,* in the same column as that which contained the arrestations and condemnations of robbers and murderers, announced almost every day that some priest guilty of having reëntered France without having obtained the permission of the government or of saying Mass without having taken the latest form of oath,[1] had been seized and banished. Even four days after the Concordat had been signed, Fouché sent a circular to the prefects, in which he vehemently denounced the priests who refused to make the promise required of them and ordered the prefects to expel them without delay from the territory of the Republic. But Fouché's hostility was at last checked by a sharp reprimand from the First Consul, who told him that his circular was written in a tone of hatred and passion unbecoming to the dignity of the government; that its principles were opposed to those of his administration, and that the power of deporting citizens would never be delegated to any local authority.[2] Fouché, therefore, by another circular, at once revoked his instructions.

While Cardinal Consalvi was still in Paris Bonaparte had expressed a strong desire that Cardinal Caprara, Bishop of Jesi (1733-1810), should be sent to Paris as Legate *a latere,* provided with the necessary powers for the purpose of reëstablishing order in religious matters in France. The Cardinal, who was then aged sixty-eight and in very delicate health,[3] had been Nuncio at Vienna, and the feeble resistance which he offered to the reforms so forcibly imposed

[1] Namely, that of fidelity to the Constitution, decreed by the Consular Government, on the 7 Nivôse, an VIII. (28 December, 1799).

[2] Boulay de la Meurthe, Documents sur la Négociation du Concordat en 1800 et 1801. Paris, 1893, t. III., No. 753, p. 445. Circulaire du Ministre de la Police aux Préfects, 20 Juillet, 1801, and No. 758, p. 450. Le Premier Consul à Fouché, 9 Août, 1801.

[3] Cardinal Caprara had been Nuncio at Cologne in 1767, at Lucerne in 1775 and at Vienna in 1785. He was made Cardinal in 1792, and Bishop of Jesi in 1800.

on the Church by the Emperor Joseph II. had much displeased Pius VI. He was, indeed, religious and charitable and possessed great capacity for the management of affairs, but he was timid; he did not uphold sufficiently the dignity of a representative of the Holy See, and he was too anxious to avoid whatever might offend the sovereigns with whom he had to treat.[4] Cardinal Consalvi states in his Memoirs that in many cases Caprara acted without first consulting the Holy Father, and sometimes even contrary to the orders which he had received, but always with the best intentions and in the belief that what he did was right.[5]

Cardinal Caprara was named Legate in a secret consistory held on August 24, 1801; he received the silver cross which was the symbol of his dignity in a public consistory on the 27th, and he reached Paris on October 4.

At the audience which Bonaparte gave the Legate on the following day he informed him that he intended to select a third of the new Bishops from among the constitutional clergy, provided they submitted to the conditions required by the Holy Father. It was not difficult for the Cardinal to point out that the nomination as Bishops of persons who had manifested their Jansenist opinions in the synod they had recently held in Paris was not exactly the way to restore religious peace in France, but rather to prepare another struggle and to develop a spirit of insubordination among the clergy. In his report to Cardinal Consalvi Caprara expressed his conviction that his reply had evidently produced a strong impression on the First Consul, but even if it had, the hostile influences always working to hinder the success of the Concordat soon effaced it, and Bonaparte remained as obstinately determined to carry out his plans as before.[6]

It was this resolution taken by the First Consul to nominate members of the constitutional clergy as Bishops and their refusal to renounce their errors in the form prescribed by the Holy See which for a considerable time presented the chief obstacle to the religious pacification of France.

After the ratification of the Concordat on August 15 Pius VII. addressed a brief to the French hierarchy, in which he exhorted them to resign their sees. He praised the services which they had already rendered to religion, but warned them that they had not as yet completed the glorious career prepared for them by Divine Providence.

---

[4] P. Ilario Rinieri, La Diplomazia Pontificia nel Secolo XIX. Roma, 1902, Vol. I., p. 321.

[5] Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi, avec une introduction et des notes par J. Crétineau-Joly. Paris, 1864, t. I., p. 404.

[6] Documents, t. IV., No. 910, p. 135. Caprara à Consalvi, Paris, 6 Octobre, 1801.

Still greater sacrifices than those by which they had so much distinguished themselves were demanded of them. The preservation of the unity of the Church and the reëstablishment of religion in France now required a new manifestation of their virtue and magnanimity. They should send him of their own accord the resignation of their sees. . . . Both in the reign of Pius VI. and in more recent times many Bishops had declared that they were willing to give up their sees if it were demanded for the good of religion; the sacrifice had now become necessary, and he had no doubt that they would make it. The Holy Father added that he was obliged by the difficulties of the times (*temporum necessitate*), to which he, too, was forced to yield, to ask them to send him, within ten days, an answer which should be final and not dilatory (*absolutum omnino esse debere, non dilatorium*). If they did not, or if by their answer they sought to gain time, he should be obliged to consider that they refused to obey his request.[7]

The brief addressed to the intrusive Bishops who belonged to the constitutional clergy was drawn up under two forms; one was addressed to them directly,[8] the other to Mgr. Spina, who still remained in Paris and who was to correspond with them in the name of the Sovereign Pontiff. He was to request them to listen to the exhortations of the Holy Father; to return to the unity of the Catholic Church, and to abandon the bishoprics which they had occupied without having been instituted by the Apostolic See. Annexed to this brief was a formula of retractation to be signed by them, declaring that they submitted to the Sovereign Pontiff and accepted the decisions of the Holy See with regard to the ecclesiastical affairs of France. Mgr. Spina was left free to make use of either form, according as he should judge most prudent, and in conformity with the preference expressed by the Holy Father he decided to employ the "indirect" form. The brief was highly approved by the French Government, and Bonaparte assured Mgr. Spina that if the intrusive Bishops did not submit to the paternal invitation of the Holy Father, he would have nothing more to say to them.[9]

Mgr. Spina, therefore, forwarded to each of the intrusive Bishops a copy of the brief which had been directed to himself, without appending, however, the formula of retractation, for in his letter which accompanied the brief he named the conditions which had been laid down by the Holy Father for their reunion with the

[7] Documents, t. III., No. 732, p. 376. Bref exhortant les évêques légitimes à se démettre, 15th August, 1801. Venerabilibus fratribus, archiepiscopis et episcopis Galliarum communionem et gratiam Sedis Apostolicae habentibus.

[8] Dilectis filiis archiepiscopis et episcopis, qui in Gallia urbsque Sedis Apostolicae institutione archiepiscopales seu episcopales Sedes occuparunt.

[9] Documents, t. III., No. 799, p. 520. Spina à Consalvi, 10 Settembre, 1801.

Church.[10] There were then living fifty-nine of the schismatic Bishops who had been elected according to the rules of the *Constitution Civile*. They speedily relinquished the sees to which they had never had any right, and wrote to the Holy Father to announce the fact. They did not, however, act thus in obedience to the demand of the Sovereign Pontiff, but, as they stated, "for the sake of peace." Their letters, too, were far from complying with the requirements of the brief, but had been drawn up, with some slight modifications, according to a form prepared by Portalis, the newly appointed Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, who stated in a report that he had composed it after long discussions and that it had conciliated all opinions. His words leave no doubt that in spite of Bonaparte's promises the resistance of the constitutional Bishops to the Holy See was countenanced and encouraged, if not by him, at least by the members of his government, who still persisted in maintaining the Gallican, or rather the Jansenistic spirit which had been the original cause of the schism.[11] In this officially inspired document the intrusive Bishops protested, indeed, that their faith was that of the Apostles; that they obeyed the Holy Father and submitted to him as the successor of St. Peter, in conformity with the canons and the decrees of the Church; that they adhered to the Concordat just concluded, and that they wished to live and die in the bosom of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church and in communion with the Holy See. They did not, however, as Cardinal Consalvi observed, make use of the expressions presented to them in the kindest possible manner by the Holy Father for the purpose of inducing them to make their retractation, but employed well-known Jansenist formulas, which had been invented for the purpose of concealing that schism under a cloak of apparent adhesion to the centre of unity. It was, therefore, impossible to accept their retractation in the form which they had adopted.[12]

[10] P. Rinieri, Vol. I., p. 346. The conditions to be performed were also fully specified in the brief.

[11] Documents, t. IV., No. 924, p. 153. Lettrés d'évêques constitutionels au Pape. Documents, No. 925, p. 155. Portalis au Premier Consul, 14 Octobre, 1801. "Je joins également copie de la formula de démission, que j'avais redigée après de longues conférences, et qui a concitré tous les esprits."

Jean Etienne Marie, Baron Portalis (1746-1807), had been before the Revolution a member of the Parliament of Aix. He was imprisoned in 1793 and set free after the death of Robespierre. Under the Directory he was accused of being a royalist and was proscribed, but fled from France, and returned in 1800, when he was named Councillor of State by Bonaparte. He was thus given the management of ecclesiastical affairs, and drew up the articles organiques in a strong Gallican spirit. Was named "Ministre des Cultes" in July, 1804, when he organized the seminaries and allowed some religious congregations to be recognized.

[12] Documents, t. IV., No. 968, p. 251. Consalvi à Caprara, Roma, 14 Nov., 1801.

At the interviews which the intrusive Bishops had at various times with Cardinal Caprara they maintained the same demeanor. They confessed that the formula which they had employed in their letter to Pius VII. had been given to them by Portalis, and they asserted that they thought that it had been drawn up in agreement with the Cardinal. They pleaded that the government had forced them to occupy sees of which the lawful titularies were still alive; that they had been ready to give them up; that by their action they had prevented the French people from losing all religion, and that in consequence they had suffered imprisonment and had been exposed to great danger.

This resistance to the will of the Sovereign Pontiff was unfortunately imitated by many of the legitimate Bishops, who had until then shown their devotion to the Church by the courage with which they had faced dangers and privations. Of the 135 prelates who in 1789 had constituted the French hierarchy, there were still eighty-one survivors, the great majority of whom were in exile and residing in various parts of Europe. On being appealed to by Pius VII., forty-five of these gave in their resignation at once; the others hesitated for some time and protested against the Holy Father's decision; some even of these prolonged their resistance until the restoration of the Bourbons in 1815.[13] The greatest opposition seems to have proceeded from those who lived in England, where the Archbishop of Narbonne held a meeting of seventeen prelates to discuss the question. He pointed out to them that the Pope in his brief had stated that in acting as he did he was forced to yield to the compulsion of circumstances,[14] and thereby seemed to imply that by resisting him they would really serve him and obey him. He maintained that the Papal brief was the result of the cunning policy of Bonaparte, who hoped that by obtaining the power of nominating the new Bishops he should be able to disseminate throughout France the doctrines most favorable to his interests. "This man, who called himself a Mussulman in Egypt, . . . was now trying to pass himself off in Europe as a Christian and a Catholic." The Archbishop's arguments, supported by those of the Bishop of Arras, who spoke in favor of the rights of the crown of France, persuaded thirteen of the prelates to decline to give up their

[13] Le R. P. Jean-Emmanuel B. Drochon des Augustins de l'Assomption. La Petite Église, Essaî historique sur le Schisme anticoncordataire. Paris, 1894, p. 37.

[14] "Cogimur, urgente temporum necessitate, quæ in hoc etiam in nos vim suam exercet . . . magno cum dolore fatendum est nullas nostras sollicitudines, nullos labores pares resistendo temporum necessitate fuisse, cui parere omnino coacti fuimus." Documents, t. III., No. 732, pp. 379-380. Bref exhortant les évêques légitimes à se démettre, 15 August, 1801.

sees, and in a letter to the Holy Father they requested him to allow them to explain their conduct, and not to come to any decision until he had considered the importance of their reasons. The four others, joined a few days later by the Bishop of Troyes on his arrival in London, placed their resignation in the hands of Mgr. Erskine, who was Cardinal Consalvi's agent in London.[15]

It should be observed that the prelates who refused to resign their sees had no intention of causing a schism in the Church, for they took care to inform the clergy of their respective dioceses that they consented that whoever should come there furnished with powers granted by the Holy Father under any form should exercise them freely as being the delegate of the Sovereign Pontiff.[16]

Nevertheless, a schism which, under the name of *La petite Église,* was at one time widely spread throughout the privinces of the south and west of France, and of which some adherents still survived not many years ago, seems to have owed its origin to two of the exiled Bishops then residing in Spain. While the other Bishops who had taken refuge in that country submitted to the Holy Father, Mgr. de Coucy, Bishop of La Rochelle, and Mgr. de Thémines, Bishop of Blois, refused to give their resignation. Mgr. de Coucy regarded Bonaparte as an usurper, who had no power to treat of religious matters in the name of France; he rejected the decisions of the Holy Father and refused to accept the Concordat. In his letter to his friends he maintained that religion could not be saved in France by making all the Bishops resign their sees, and that such a measure could not have been the fruit of the wisdom of the Holy Father if he had been left to himself, but that he had been led astray by perfidious promises of the restoration of religion.[17] These letters, as well as pamphlets circulated in his name and for which he was not responsible attacking Bonaparte, the Concordat and even the Sovereign Pontiff, excited among the clergy in the provinces of La Vendée, Maine, Anjou, and especially Poitou, a spirit of resistance to the Concordat. They refused to publish it, to take the oath to the civil authorities which it prescribed or to acknowledge the Bishop whom Pius VII. had named in the place of Mgr. de Coucy. Such

[15] Documents, t. IV., No. 895, p. 93. Réunion des évêques Français à Londres, 21 Septembre, 1801. Documents, No. 896, p. 97. Erskine à Consalvi, 22 Septembre, 1801. Documents, No. 898, p. 99. Otto (the agent of the French Government in England) à Talleyrand, 25 Septembre, 1801. Documents, No. 899, p. 104. Les Evêques réfugiés en Angleterre au Pape, 27 Septembre, 1801.

[16] Drochon, p. 61.

[17] Drochon, p. 52. From 1804 Mgr. de Coucy had held no further communication with his diocese, but letters still were circulated in his name. (From a letter of Mgr. du Chilleau, Bishop of Chalons sur Saone, 5th Nov., 1804; same, p. 142.)

was Bonaparte's irritation at the opposition displayed against the Concordat and the new order of things in France by Mgr. de Coucy and Mgr. de Thémines, who was also accused of creating discord in his diocese by his writings, that in February, 1804, he obliged Charles IV. of Spain to imprison them. They were released in 1807 by the intervention of Cardinal Fesch. Mgr. de Thémines in 1810 took refuge in England, where for some years he still continued his opposition to the Holy See. He repented, however, when on his deathbed in Brussels in 1829, and in presence of the Papal Internuncio, Mgr. Cappacini, he made the declaration of submission to the Sovereign Pontiff which had been drawn up by Mgr. Poynter, Vicar Apostolic for the London district, for the use of the French priests residing in England.[18]

Mgr. de Coucy's resistance was not so prolonged. In 1815, when, after the battle of Waterloo, the Bourbons were again restored, there survived only sixteen of those Bishops who had refused to tender their resignation; the others had been nearly all reconciled with the Holy See before their death. Mgr. de Coucy, who a few years later was named Archbishop of Rheims, was among those who in 1816 submitted to Pius VII. and humbly craved pardon for their resistance to his will. The remainder soon followed their example, and by 1820 Mgr. de Thémines alone persisted in his refusal.[19] The schism was, however, perpetuated in various parts of France by several members of the clergy, who, having followed their Bishops in their refusal to accept the Concordat, declined to imitate them in their retractation. Their numbers were gradually reduced by their conversion or their death, but when they had disappeared their followers still maintained a semblance of religion, meeting on Sunday to recite the prayers for Mass and Vespers as well as on the feasts which had been suppressed by the Concordat. As lately as 1893, besides a few very small groups of these dissidents in the Dioceses of Montpellier and of Lyons, there were still in Bas-Poitou (Departments of Les Deux-Sevres and La Vendée) as many as 2,400, whose numbers were gradually diminishing, and in 1903, according to Cardinal Mathieu, they were only represented by a handful of peasants.[20]

In the audience which Bonaparte gave to Cardinal Caprara on November 1 he proved that he supported the schismatic clergy in

---

[18] Drochon, p. 165, p. 213.

[19] Drochon, p. 145.

[20] Drochon, p. 282. Cardinal Mathieu, Le Concordat de 1801. Les origines, son histoire, Paris, 1903, p. 83. "La petite église en ce moment achéve de mouvie, ayant perdu, il y a fort longtemps son dernier prêtre, et tout récemment ses derniers chefs couvertiss par Léon XIII. . . . représentée seulement par une poignée de paysans."

their resistance to the demands of the Holy See, though there was no doubt that if he chose he could have insisted on their submission. With a great show of irritation and his usual impetuosity, he poured forth a torrent of the most bitter accusations against the Romans (*a guisa di torrente,* like a torrent). They sought to lead him by the nose, he said, with their endless delay in forwarding the bull for the delimitation of the new dioceses; they laid snares for him by persuading the Pope not to accept the constitutional Bishops whom he intended to name to the number of fifteen. The Cardinal vainly repeated the objections which he had made on a previous occasion. He could only obtain an assurance that none of the leading members of the schism should be chosen, and to his request that they might at least be obliged to submit and to make the declaration prescribed in the Holy Father's brief, Bonaparte replied "that the demand was arrogant and that to comply with it would be cowardly." He then began a long dissertation on the canonical institution and ended by declaring that "the profession of faith made by the Bishops and their oath of obedience to the Pope were as good as a thousand acts of submission."[21]

On the previous day the Abbé Bernier, by order of the First Consul, had presented to the Legate a note containing five questions, which would seem to have been intended to ascertain what concessions the Holy See was inclined to make and what was the extent of the powers it had conferred on Cardinal Caprara. The government wished to know: First. If the new delimitation of the dioceses would be accepted by the Pope? Second. If, in that case, the government might announce at once that there would be only fifty sees in France, ten of which would be archbishoprics? Third. Might it also announce that these sees would be those designated by the government? Fourth. Had the Cardinal the power to grant jurisdiction at once to the new Bishops to be named by the Consul, so that they could be consecrated as soon as possible after their nomination? Fifth. If he had not, could he not at least guarantee that the Sovereign Pontiff would grant the canonical institution to the Bishops designated by the First Consul, even if several of them had been constitutional Bishops?[22] Cardinal Caprara prudently refrained from giving an answer in writing to these questions; they were not even mentioned at the audience of the following day, but, as has just been seen, his attempt to obtain any concession met with no success.

It was Bonaparte's intention to publish the Concordat on the 18th

---

[21] Documents, t. IV., No. 979, p. 272. Caprara à Consalvi, Parigi, 2 Novembre, 1801.

[22] Rinieri, I., p. 381.

Brumaire (9th November), the anniversary of the overthrow of the Directory, and at the same time the demarcation of the new sees and the nominations of the fifty new prelates. He thought that by presenting to the public the restored Catholic Church of France fully formed and complete in all its details, he would disarm hostile criticism and earn the admiration of a people always ready to worship success and easily pleased with a brilliant and theatrical stroke of policy.[23] At the same time a great feast was to celebrate the signing of the preliminaries of peace with England and the conclusion of treaties with Russia, Bavaria, Portugal and Turkey, which had at last brought about the general pacification of Europe. For the publication of the Concordat, however, it was necessary that the bull for the delimitation of the new bishoprics should have been received in Paris, as the First Consul could not nominate to sees not yet in existence and the new Bishops canonically instituted. But for that it was necessary that the existing Bishops should have replied to the Papal brief which demanded their resignation, and Mgr. Spina, in whose hands copies of this document were placed, could not forward them until the Concordat had been ratified by the First Consul.[24] To Bonaparte's great displeasure the proclamation of the Concordat was, therefore, deferred until Christmas.

The obstinacy with which Bonaparte insisted on nominating some of the intrusive Bishops to the newly created sees, without any retractation of their errors, caused the Holy Father and his minister the most profound grief. In a letter addressed to the Papal Nuncios, Cardinal Consalvi acknowledges that the intrusive Bishops had won a complete victory. They had refused to submit to the conditions imposed by the Holy Father, who had made every concession to them; they had confirmed their error by the very form in which they had announced to him the resignation of their sees, and yet the French Government maintained that they had sufficiently atoned for their past conduct by resigning their sees at the demand of the Pope and accepting the Concordat, and that nothing more could be asked of them.[25] To satisfy, however, the impatience of Bonaparte, and with the object of making every effort to avoid "the incalculable evils which would threaten religion if his will were opposed," the bull for the damarcation of the new dioceses was forwarded on December 2, though the Bishops whose resignations had been asked for had not yet replied. Cardinal Caprara was also

[23] Documents, t. IV., No. 982, p. 283. Portalis à Cacault, Paris, 3 Novembre, 1801.

[24] Documents, t. IV., No. 987, p. 294. Consalvi à Caprara, Roma, 18 Novembre, 1801.

[25] Documents, t. IV., No. 988, p. 295. Consalvi aux Nonces, Roma, 21 Novembre, 1801.

authorized to give canonical institution in the name of the Pope to the new Bishops as soon as they should be nominated, and after making a summary inquiry with regard to them (*un processo sommario*). This would meet the views of Bonaparte, who said that under the circumstances in which religion was being restored he wanted to nominate the new Bishops, have them consecrated and send them to their new dioceses within twenty-four hours, so as to allow no time for any opposition or resistance to be offered. But the Holy Father refused to accept the nomination of the intrusive Bishops unless they submitted to the decisions of the Holy See with regard to the ecclesiastical affairs of France and acknowledged the illegality of their election and consecration, as they had been required to do by the brief *"Post muttos labores."*[26]

Cardinal Consalvi repeated these observations in a letter to M. Cacault, the French Ambassador in Rome, pointing out to him that in eighteen centuries there had been no example in the Church of such a measure as the suppression of ancient dioceses without the consent of the Bishops, but in a matter of such importance, and in the extraordinary state of affairs then existing, the Holy Father consented to "pass over every canonical regulation." Cardinal Caprara had also been authorized to give the newly elected Bishops the canonical jurisdiction by means of letters patent, although according to the terms of the Concordat nothing was to be changed in the ancient and more lengthy forms of procedure which had existed before the revolution.[27]

The refusal of the constitutional Bishops to make their recantation in the form demanded by the brief of the Holy Father and the resistance of many of the legitimate Bishops to his request that they should resign their sees were not the only hindrances which delayed the proclamation of the Concordat. The winter session of the Tribunate, the Legislative Body and the Senate had just begun (22d November, 1801), and the three assemblies soon displayed a strong opposition to the First Consul, who seemed to aim at the reëstablishment of a monarchical government, and his Concordat was especially obnoxious to them, for it was a most counter-revolutionary transaction. The Tribunate showed its animosity by severely criticizing the treaties of peace which Bonaparte had just concludeed, especially that with Russia, in which he was accused of having made concessions unworthy of the dignity of republican France. The Tribunate also opposed and the Legislative Body rejected the preliminary part

[26] Documents, t. IV., No. 994, p. 305. Consalvi aux Nonces, Roma, 28 Novembre, 1801.

[27] Documents, t. IV., No. 998, p. 320. Note de Consalvi à Cacault, 30 Novembre, 1801.

and two of the first three laws of the *Code Civil,* which had just been drawn up under the presidency of Bonaparte by the Council of State.[28] It was an institution of which they were jealous, as in order to form it the First Consul had selected the most capable men of business he could find and carried out his most important undertakings by their aid. Some of the generals, too, made no secret of their animosity against Bonaparte; of their discontent at having to submit to one who had been their equal, and of the irritation they felt on seeing the restoration of the Catholic Church, which they thought they had destroyed. They were displeased with the peace which had contributed so much to Bonaparte's glory; they found themselves, after ten years of warfare and lawlessness, once more subordinated to the civil authorities under a firm government, and they hoped that by the overthrow of the First Consul they might be able to bring back the anarchy, the licentiousness and the corruption of the Directory.[29] The great majority, however, of the army as well as of the nation was thoroughly devoted to Bonaparte, and, trusting to their support, he resolved to employ energetic measures to overcome the resistance of the assemblies and force them to accept the Concordat.

Bonaparte therefore withdrew the *Code Civil* from further discussion; he did not, indeed, dismiss the Tribunate and the Legislative Body, but he left them without employment, in a state of inactivity and with the responsibility of having put a stop, by their factious spirit, to the plans he had formed for the good of France. He then left for Lyons, where he presided over a congress of five hundred of the most distinguished citizens of the Cisalpine Republic, for which he drew up a new form of Constitution. Its name was then changed to that of the Italian Republic, and he was proclaimed its President.

During this interval Cambacérès, the Second Consul, was charged with the duty of eliminating those members of the Tribunate and of the Legislative Body who by their animosity against Bonaparte's undertakings had shown that they would certainly vote against the Concordat, and of replacing them by others who might be expected to vote in accordance with Bonaparte's wishes.

By the 38th article of the Constitution which had been drawn up in November, 1799, one-fifth of the Tribunate and of the Legislative Body was to be renewed in the year X.[30] The members to be

[28] Albert Sorel, L'Europe et la Révolution Française. Paris, 1903, t. VI., p. 173, p. 214. Adolphe Thiers, History of the Consulate and the Empire of France. London, 1893, Vol. II., pp. 185, 201.

[29] Sorel, t. VI., p. 217.

[30] The year X was comprised between 23d September, 1801, and 22d September, 1802.

excluded were to be indicated by the Senate, but the method of doing so had not been specified, and the Senate might be persuaded to remove by ballot instead of by lot those who had led the opposition and had impeded all legislation. The plan, mainly due to Cambacérès, succeeded. The more influential members of the Senate were won over, and on January 15 and 18, 1802, it decided, by a large majority, that the renewals should take place immediately, and that the ballot should be employed for the purpose, but that it was to indicate not those who should leave the two assemblies, but those who should remain. By this means sixty members of the Legislative Body and twenty of the Tribunate, who had been most opposed to Bonaparte's views and were especially hostile to the Catholic religion, were excluded and their successors chosen, also by the Senate, from the lists of candidates presented by the departments.[31]

In spite of Bonaparte's declaration that he was resolved to name some of the constitutional clergy to the new bishoprics, Cardinal Caprara still hoped that he would not persist in this resolution, and in more than one letter to Cardinal Consalvi he expressed his conviction that none of the intrusive Bishops would be named. Bonaparte, on his side, according to his usual practice of taking by surprise at the last moment the persons with whom he was transacting business, deliberately kept the Cardinal in ignorance of his real intentions; for in the month of December he told a friend of Caprara's that he would not say whether he would or would not name any of the intrusive Bishops, but that the Cardinal should have confidence in him, and that he would certainly act in concert with him in the matter.[32] Caprara still continued, however, to implore of the First Consul to abandon his plans with regard to the constitutional clergy and to warn him that by choosing Bishops from their ranks he would overthrow the edifice which he had constructed, and that instead of the peace which he sought, he would bring about religious dissensions, which are the most disastrous of all. Even Portalis, the recently named Minister of Religion, presented to Bonaparte a strongly worded memorial, in which he pointed out to him that the reports forwarded by the prefects from all parts of the republic agreed in stating that public opinion was altogether in favor of the priests who had not taken the constitutional oath, and that their churches were the most frequented. Even in the days of the "Terror" the fury of the revolutionists had never been able to force the majority of the citizens to attend the religious services celebrated by the constitutional clergy, and the ignorance and bad conduct of

---

[31] Thiers, *id.*, p. 236.

[32] Documents, IV., No. 1,035, p. 455. Caprara à Consalvi, Parigi, 5 Decembre, 1801.

many members of that clergy had much contributed to strengthen the aversion they inspired. Portalis again warned the First Consul, when sending him an annotated list of the intrusive Bishops, that they had not the confidence of the people, and that hardly one of them had any claim to be trusted by him. If, therefore, such men were placed in charge of the dioceses, the great work of the reëstablishment of religion would be compromised. There were, indeed, a few who were learned and virtuous, but they would have much to do to overcome the repugnance which the people felt for them.[33]

In spite of these warnings, Bonaparte, who towards the end of March had decided to increase the number of the new sees from fifty to sixty, still persisted in his resolution to nominate some of the intrusive Bishops. He still, however, carefully concealed his intentions from Caprara, probably lest the Cardinal should have the time to apply to Rome for advice and further instructions; but in order to make sure that the persons whom he should nominate should run no risk of being rejected by the Legate at the last moment, he sent the Abbé Bernier and Portalis to obtain from the Cardinal a formal declaration on the subject. Caprara replied that in order to put an end to the schism the Holy Father, even though it would be very painful to him, would allow the First Consul to name some constitutionals. He as Legate would then reconcile them to the Church, according to the rules which had been laid down for him, after making what remarks and observations he should judge necessary. But Bonaparte was not content with merely verbal assurances; he wished to have this concession guaranteed by the Legate's signature, and he obtained it thus.

On March 27 Cardinal Caprara was warned by a note from Bernier that on the following day he was to be solemnly received at Notre Dame according to the ancient ceremonial prescribed for Legates, and the "Te Deum" would be sung in thanksgiving for peace. The authorities would then pay him formal visits, and on April 5 he would be received by the First Consul in a public audience, after which he was to consecrate the new Bishops. On the evening of the same day Bernier and Portalis came to inform him that it was the desire of the First Consul that both the clergy in communion with the Church and the constitutional or schismatic clergy should assist at the ceremony of the following day. The Cardinal, though thus taken by surprise, pointed out to Portalis the impossibility of yielding to this request, and though Portalis assured

---

[33] Documents, V., No. 1,171, p. 199. Note de Caprara au Premier Consul, Febbraio, 1802. *Id.*, V., No. 1,163, p. 164. Rapport de Portalis, Paris, 20 Février, 1802. *Id.*, *id.*, No. 1,172, p. 200. Rapport de Portalis sur les nominations à l'Épiscopat, Paris, vers le 20 Février, 1802.

him that Bonaparte, who wanted to have a numerous gathering of clergy in order to give the ceremony greater solemnity, would be so irritated by his refusal that all the labor and care bestowed on the Concordat would be wasted and France allowed to remain in a state of schism, he still refused to give way, though he expressed his willingness to listen to some proposal which should not be at variance with his duty. The Abbé Bernier then said that he had foreseen that the Cardinal would refuse to take part in the ceremony at Notre Dame along with the constitutional clergy; he had, therefore, together with Portalis, prepared a document which he presented to him, assuring him at the same time that he would not find in it anything conflicting with his duty. The affair, he thought, might indeed be arranged if the Cardinal were to express his refusal under a form which should please the First Consul, whose anger might otherwise have fatal consequences.

In this paper, drawn up in the Cardinal's name and addressed to Portalis, the Legate was made to agree that the constitutional Bishops and priests did not require to be reconsecrated or reordained, also that the First Consul might nominate those constitutional Bishops whom he considered worthy. He also agreed that all parties should be reunited, and that, therefore, after giving canonical institution to the Bishops whom it should please the First Consul to name, he would proceed to reunite them (*je procederai à leur réunion*), so that nothing should remain which might give rise to disorder or be a cause of humiliation. But until these constitutional Bishops demanded canonical institution in the usual form and received it, they were not in communion with the Holy Father, by whom they had not been instituted. This communion should therefore be established after the publication of the Concordat by the demand and grant of the canonical institution in virtue of the Concordat until when he, as Legate, could not recognize those who, since ten years, had ceased to hold the usual relations with the Holy See. The Cardinal was then made to express his readiness to go to Notre Dame without requiring the presence of any of the former Bishops or of the priests who were faithful to them, and thus avoid any cause of disturbance, but he could not hold any communication with the constitutional Bishops and priests until the publication of the Concordat and the demand and grant of canonical institution in compliance with its rules. He therefore left the First Consul free to name whatever ecclesiastic he might think fit to receive him at Notre Dame.

Cardinal Caprara had been thrown off his guard by the unexpected visit of Bonaparte's emissaries. He was much alarmed by their threatening language, and he was always only too ready to

make any concession by which he might hope to put a speedy end to the schism. He therefore made a few changes in the wording of the document, and said to Bernier: "Since you, who have considered the contents of this paper coolly and conscientiously and not hurriedly, assure me that it contains nothing contrary to our principles and maxims, I shall not refuse to have it copied and give it to you signed, with no other object than to avoid a difficulty which you both make me fear might prove fatal."[34]

On the same evening the Cardinal was informed by a note from Bernier that his letter had produced the result that they had expected. The First Consul had decided that as the absence of the clergy would deprive the "Te Deum" of the necessary solemnity, it should be deferred until the ratification of the peace. By that time the Concordat would have been published and the Cardinal would then be surrounded by a clergy recognized and instituted. Bonaparte might well make this concession, for he had obtained what he wanted—a promise in writing that the Legate would give canonical institution to the Bishops he might choose to name.

The Cardinal was at last informed of the First Consul's decision on March 30 at an audience which he had demanded for the purpose of offering his congratulations on the peace of Amiens. Bonaparte then told him frankly for the first time that among the new Bishops there would be a few of the constitutional clergy. Caprara objected that evil would inevitably result from their nomination, as he was well aware, since protestations were being continually made against it; but Bonaparte replied that the Pope had stated in his note to Cacault that if the constitutional Bishops performed what he had prescribed, he would accept them and give them canonical institution.[35] It was therefore useless to say any more on the subject. His decision was made—either that or nothing; two Archbishops and eight Bishops were to be nominated among the constitutional clergy. The Cardinal still continued to plead, but could obtain no other answer than: "Either that or nothing; the Pope has promised; the Pope must

[34] Documents, V., No. 1,197, p. 269. Caprara à Consalvi, Parigi, 4 Aprile, 1802. Documents, V., No. 1,194, p. 264. Note de Caprara à Portalis, Paris, 27 Mars, 1802.

[35] Documents, IV., No. 998, p. 323. Note de Consalvi à Cacault, 30 Novembre, 1801. "His Holiness has given a clear proof that he does not entertain such a sentiment (of pride, in refusing to accept the formula adopted by the intrusive Bishops in their letters) . . . by being the first to invite them, by the brief addressed to Mgr. Spina, and communicated by him to them, to be reunited by laying down their error. . . . His Holiness is ready to give a new proof of it . . . by readmitting them to communion with him, and even by instituting some of them, if named to the new churches, provided they perform what was prescribed to them in the said brief and in the instruction sent to the Cardinal Legate at the same time."

keep his word if he wishes the Concordat to be published and that France should not continue to be separated from unity." When Caprara remarked that it was thought that both the laity would refuse to acknowledge and obey the constitutional Bishops, Bonaparte answered: "I shall not deport to Cayenne the ecclesiastics who will dare to do that, but I shall send them all without exception to Romagna (a province of the Papal States) and distribute them among its cities." The Cardinal could only retort that since the Pope had yielded with regard to the nomination and canonical institution of the intrusive Bishops, it was his duty to carry out the instructions he had received and to insist that they should observe to the letter the conditions which had been laid down by the Holy Father. On hearing this firm language, Bonaparte gave signs of much irritation (*manifesto marcato sdegno*), and after some further discussion he turned to Portalis, who had assisted at the interview, and said to him: "You have heard what the Legate wishes; you shall, therefore, be responsible for it."[36]

The Tribunate and the Legislative Body, from which the principal opponents of the government had been carefully excluded, met for an extraordinary session on April 5, when the Concordat was laid before them. The Tribunate passed it by a majority of 78 to 7; the Legislative Body by a majority of 228 to 28, and it became law on April 8, 1802, under the name of "La Loi du 18 Germinal, an X." Along with it was voted, so as to form one law, a collection of seventy-seven regulations known as *Les Articles Organiques,* intended to define the relations between the State and the Catholic Church and to establish a claim on the part of the State to interfere on every possible occasion in the discipline of the Church and in the administration of purely ecclesiastical matters. Thus the authorization of the government was required before any bull, brief or rescript from Rome or the decrees of a foreign synod, or even of a general council could be published in France, and no Legate or Nuncio of the Holy See could exercise his functions without having obtained it. The rules of the diocesan seminaries were to be submitted to the approbation of the First Consul, and their professors were to be bound to sign the declaration made by the French clergy in 1682, and to teach its doctrines. The exercise by a Bishop of his right to form a chapter as well as the choice and the number of the ecclesiastics destined to compose it also required the authorization of the government. The parish priests were forbidden to bring any accusation in their sermons against any persons or against the other forms of religion authorized in the State, and they were to give the nuptial

[36] Documents, t. V., No. 1,198, p. 274. Caprara à Consalvi, Parigi, 4 Aprile, 1802.

blessing only to those who could prove that they had already contracted a civil marriage. These few extracts must suffice to show the general character of the *Articles Organiques,* which have been described as the "quintessence of that spirit known as Gallicanism, which has always been condemned by Rome."[37]

These articles may be considered as the result of the efforts of the Jacobins and the infidels, who, having failed to prevent Bonaparte from concluding the Concordat, now sought to restrict the little freedom it allowed the Church and to eliminate whatever it might contain favorable to religion. It was a resuscitation and a development of the vexatious regulations by which the Kings of France had sought to subject the Church to the State, although the Bourbon monarchy and its institutions had been so recently swept away in the name of liberty. Even on the day following the conclusion of the Concordat d'Hauteville, one of Talleyrand's secretaries in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, addressed, in the absence of his superior,[38] a long protest to the First Consul against many of the concessions which had been made to Rome in opposition to the advice of Talleyrand, who brought the matter forward again in a report shortly before the ratification of the Concordat. He pointed out to Bonaparte that some of the fundamental conditions which he had laid down and which it seemed useful to maintain had been set aside, a statement calculated to arouse the suspicions of the First Consul and put him on his guard. Talleyrand then repeated d'Hauteville's objections, but more concisely. He regretted that the religious belief professed by the members of the government should have been introduced into a public document; that the power of creating ecclesiastical foundations should have been allowed too much latitude; that seminaries and chapters should have been mentioned, and that the convention should have contained no stipulation for the interests of the constitutional clergy or of the priests who had been secularized by marriage or by a voluntary renunciation. He thought, however, that the First Consul, after ratifying the convention, could provide against any inconvenience which might result if it were literally executed by special decrees referring to each particular case.[39]

The Councillor of State, Portalis, was charged with the prepara-

---

[37] Rinieri, Vol. I., p. 431.

[38] Talleyrand had gone to pass some weeks at the baths of Bourbon-l'Archambault. Cardinal Consalvi considered that the final concessions which enabled him to conclude the Concordat would not have been obtained but for the absence from Paris of this "powerful adversary." Documents, t. III., No. 650, p. 258. Consalvi à Doria, 13 Luglio, 1801.

[39] Documents, t. III., No. 778, p. 483. Rapport de Talleyrand au Premier Consul, 29 Août, 1801.

tion of the *Articles Organiques*. Much of this code was dictated to him by Bonaparte, for the First Consul,[40] though resolved to restore religion in France in spite of the opposition of the infidel party, sought to diminish the power of the clergy as much as possible and render it dependent on the State. The publication of these articles at the same time as the Concordat was considered in Rome as an attempt to suggest that they formed part of it. Caprara, indeed, assured Cardinal Consalvi that everybody was convinced of the contrary, but Portalis in his speech before the Legislative Body had spoken more than once of "the convention with the Pope and the organic articles of that convention,"[41] and Consalvi might well maintain that only one conclusion could be drawn from his words—namely, that they had been agreed to by the Pope.[42]

Organic articles to define the relations of the French Calvinists and Lutherans with the State were published at the same time as those annexed to the Concordat, but while the Holy Father had not been consulted with regard to the regulations bearing upon the Catholic Church, those for the Protestant sects were drawn up according to instructions furnished by representatives whom the various communities had been asked to send to Paris for that purpose.[43]

When the Papal Government had learned that the Legate at his official reception would be expected to take an oath to the First Consul, researches were made in the Roman archives to ascertain what course had been followed on previous occasions in the time of the monarchy, but no record of any such formality could be found. Some French writers, indeed, mentioned some cases, but without specifying any precise form, and it seemed to have consisted merely in a promise that the Legate would exercise his powers only so long as it should please the King. Pius VII. thought, therefore, that

[40] "Dans ce travail j'ai été dirigé par les notes sages et profondes que j'avais prises sous votre dictée, et j'ai marché avec confiance." Documents, t. IV., No. 941, p. 195. Portalis au Premier Consul, 24 Octobre, 1801.

[41] Documents, t. IV., No. 1,213, p. 389. Discours de Portalis sur l'organisation des Cultes, 5 Avril, 1802. "La Convention avec le Pape, et les articles organiques de cette Convention, participent à la nature des traités diplomatiques, c'est à dire à la nature d'un véritable contrait."

[42] Documents, V., No. 1,271, p. 581. Consalvi à Caprara, Roma, 5 Maggio, 1802. Cardinal di Pietro, in his report to Pius VII., was also of opinion that the expressions employed by Portalis might lead one to believe that the organic articles formed part of the Concordat. Rinieri, Vol. I., p. 439.

[43] Documents, t. III., No. 759, p. 452. Le Premier Consul à Chaptal, 10 Août, 1801. "Je désire . . . que vous donniez l'ordre aux préfets des cinq départements de la République où il y a le plus de protestants, et à celui de Genève pour les calvinistes, l'envoyer à Paris, auprès de vous, chacun un des principaux ministres du culte protestant . . . le but de cette mesure est de concerter les moyens de maintenir le bon ordre, la liberté et l'indépendance des cultes."

Cardinal Caprara ought not to take any oath unless absolutely forced to do so. In that case he should only promise to refrain from doing anything contrary or injurious to the government, and to resign the legation when the government should wish it.[44] But he was not to take the oath in the form which had been proposed by the French authorities, and he should not swear to observe the laws of the republic or to maintain the so-called liberties of the Gallican Church. Caprara seems to have been given to understand that he would not be asked to take any oath. At the end of February he assured Cardinal Consalvi that the matter had been arranged in such a way that there should be no oath, but that on being presented he should compliment the First Consul in a speech,[45] assuring him that the legation should cease whenever it pleased the government, and that while it lasted nothing should be done against the rights of the State or of the nation.

Whatever verbal assurances may have been given to Cardinal Caprara that he should not be asked to take the oath to the First Consul were set aside and taken into no account when, on the day before the audience, the decree authorizing him to act as Legate was drawn up, for it required that he should swear to "conform to the laws of the State and to the liberties of the Gallican Church." Contrary to all the usages of diplomatic courtesy, Cardinal Caprara was not informed of the date of his official reception until the very morning of the day on which it was to take place, and an hour before setting out he was given a copy of the oath, which he was to read and sign after making his complimentary speech to the First Consul. The Cardinal does not state clearly when the demand for his signature was made, but it would seem to have been at the audience after he had made his speech. He positively refused to sign the document, "although in substance it was only a confirmation of the words employed by me in the speech," but "for the sake of peace (*per quieto vivere*) and in order not to cause any embarrassment or inconvenience," he consented to read it.[46] Caprara forwarded this document to Rome. It was not drawn up according to the terms of the decree issued by the Consuls, and did not mention the *laws* of the republic or the liberties of the Gallican Church, but merely bound

[44] Documents, t. III., No. 735, p. 388. Note sur le serment du Légat (vers le 15 Août, 1801). Documents, t. IV., No. 888, p. 69. Suite des Instructions pour le Légat, Roma, 5 Ottobre, 1801.

[45] Documents, t. V., No. 1,174, p. 211. Caprara à Consalvi, 27 Febbraio, 1802. "L'affare è combinato in modo che non vi sarà questione di giniraments; ed in quella vece si à concertato che io, nel presentarmi, faccia un complimento."

[46] Even Padre Rinieri cannot decide where the demand was made, "on account of the obscurity both of language and of thought with which the Cardinal's letters are written." Rinieri, I., 452.

him to retire whenever it should please the First Consul; to observe the *statutes* and customs of the republic, and to do nothing derogatory to the jurisdiction and the rights of the government.[47]

The Cardinal's surprise and indignation may well be imagined, therefore, when, in the official account of the audience published in the *Moniteur* on the following day, he read that he had taken an oath according to the form prescribed by the decree and, moreover, that he had signed it and put his seal to it. It was useless to protest against this deceitful act; he was told that such things were not worthy of attention; that such had always been the custom on the occasion of a legation, as might be seen from the books which gave the history of the Legates *a latere;* that the Parliaments had done the same formerly, and that such articles were copied from the parliamentary registers. Caprara could obtain no redress, and the decree of the Consuls and the oath which he was falsely reported to have taken were reproduced by the French and Continental press, to the great displeasure of the Holy Father,[48] for an impression was thus created that the republican laws contrary to the Catholic religion and the so-called "liberties of the Gallican Church, which had always been condemned in Rome, had at last been accepted and approved of.

Cardinal Caprara's first duty when officially acknowledged as Legate was to reconcile with the Church the schismatic Bishops, whom neither his arguments nor his supplications could prevent the First Consul from nominating to some of the newly formed sees. According to the Cardinal, Bonaparte personally was not favorable to them, but the very powerful anti-religious party, composed of Jacobins and former members of the convention which protected them, told him openly that unless he nominated some of the constitutional clergy Bishops, the Concordat should not be published, and that matters should not be left in the state in which they were—meaning probably by these words to hold out the threat of another "reign of terror" and a fresh persecution of the Church. Bonaparte refused, however, to allow the schismatic clergy to make a retractation which he considered too humiliating, and he maintained that it would be quite enough for them to renounce the civil constitution and accept the Concordat.

Of the prelates nominated to the sixty newly formed dioceses, sixteen had belonged to the hierarchy of pre-revolutionary times, twelve were constitutionals who had illegally occupied their sees

---

[47] "Item servaturus statuta et consuetudines Reipublicæ et nunquam jurisdictioni ac juribus Gubernii derogaturum." Documents, t. V., No. 1,225, p. 447. Réception du Légat, 9 Avril, 1802.

[48] Documents, t. V., No. 1,243, p. 494. Caprara à Consalvi, 18 Aprile, 1802. Documents, t. V., No. 1,271, p. 580. Consalvi à Caprara, Roma, 5 Maggio, 1802.

and thirty-two were chosen from the parochial clergy.[49] The sixteen former Bishops and ten of the constitutional Bishops were nominated before Easter; two of the latter had, since some time, retracted their errors and been reconciled with the Church, but the eight others still offered an obstinate resistance. On April 15 (Holy Thursday) most of them came to Cardinal Caprara to solicit the canonical institution, but they refused to comply with his request that they should sign a letter to the Holy Father, drawn up in the terms which he had prescribed, and in which they were made to express their acceptance of the decrees of the Holy See with regard to the ecclesiastical affairs of France and their acknowledgment that the councils which they had held were illegal and schismatic. They then went to the Minister, Portalis, and drew up another formula of submission, in which they declared that they abandoned the civil constitution of the clergy (which had long ceased to exist); that they accepted the Concordat which had been just concluded; that they would obey the Holy Father and his successors, and they asked to be granted the favor of canonical institution. This letter was immediately forwarded to Caprara, and late that evening both Portalis and Bernier, who on Palm Sunday had been consecrated Bishop of Orleans as a reward for his services, again attacked the Cardinal on the subject, making every effort to induce him to adopt it and not to insist on the use of the expressions prescribed by the Holy Father. It was not difficult for the Legate to prove the insufficiency of the forms which the schismatics had employed in their letter and the impossibility of granting canonical institution to the intrusive Bishops unless they had previously abjured their errors. The reply was the usual threat by which the government always sought to intimidate the Legate—that his refusal to yield would upset all that had been done, and Portalis spoke insolently of what he called the pretentions of Rome, but after a long discussion the interview came to an end without any concession having been made on either side.[50]

Cardinal Caprara passed an anxious night, for he had been given to understand that he might expect to receive the order to leave Paris, and on the morning of Good Friday he had even begun to prepare for his departure when Bernier appeared. He came to make a last effort to persuade the Legate to accept the letter which the constitutional Bishops had written to the Pope. He spoke, as usual, of the heavy responsibility which the Cardinal would incur if he refused; it depended on him whether France was to remain schismatic and atheistic or become once more Catholic. The preparations

[49] Documents, t. V., No. 1,232, p. 464. Note, Premières nominations à l'épiscopat, 9 Avril, 1802. Rinieri, I., 461.

[50] Documents, t. V., No. 1,241, p. 489. Portalis à Bernier, Paris, 15 Avril, 1802. Documents, t. V., No. 1,243, p. 499. Caprara à Consalvi.

for the feast at Notre Dame on Easter Sunday, when the Legate was to say Mass and the "Te Deum" was to be sung in action of thanks for the restoration of religion in France and for the peace, had been suspended, he said, and it was for the Cardinal to decide whether the Concordat was to be published or whether France was to be allowed to relapse into infidelity and lead away with her, perhaps, all Europe. The unfortunate Cardinal, terrified by Bernier's threats and anxious to be relieved of some of his responsibility, sent for the theologians of the legation and asked them if, in consideration of the danger to which religion was exposed in France, he might consent to accept the letter to the Pope as proposed by the constitutional Bishops. The theologians, four in number, agreed that there was not an expression in the letter which indicated that the schismatic Bishops confessed their errors and abandoned them. On the contrary, they had carefully avoided whatever might imply such a confession, and they had, therefore, shown themselves unworthy of being reconciled with the Church.

Bernier was on the point of returning to Portalis to inform him of the failure of the negotiation. He said with tears in his eyes that it was all over with religion in France, and that all the labor undergone in the attempt to restore it would be thrown away, when the Legate declared that he was willing to make some further concessions, if by so doing he could succeed in retaining France in unity with the See of Rome.

One of his advisers then suggested a compromise by which he could extricate himself from the difficulty. Provided the substance of the abjuration to be made by the constitutional Bishops—that is to say, the confession and the abjuration of their errors—remained unchanged, the form might vary; it might be made in writing or in some other way. It was not unusual in the Church for heretics to make their abjuration secretly and verbally, and then to be reconciled. Let the schismatic Bishops, therefore, send their own formula to the Holy Father, and thereby satisfy the French Government, but make compensation for its deficiencies by a verbal abjuration. Whenever the *processus* for their canonical institution should take place, the purity of their faith, of their doctrines and of their morals would have to be attested by witnesses, who could not prove that these Bishops had abandoned the schism unless they were perfectly certain of it. The schismatic Bishops should therefore be bound to declare in presence of these witnesses that they had given up the sees they had occupied; that they promised to obey the Sovereign Pontiff, and that they accepted the judgments pronounced by the Holy See with regard to the ecclesiastical affairs of France.[51]

[51] Documents, t. V., No. 1,243, p. 501. Caprara à Consalvi, 18 Aprile, 1802.

The suggestion was accepted by Cardinal Consalvi and by Bernier, and decrees of absolution were drawn up, in which the Legate caused to be inserted the three conditions specified by the Holy Father which had to be complied with before the absolution could be granted. These were placed in Bernier's hands, and on the following day he brought back an attestation that he had given them to five of the constitutional Bishops, who had received them with due respect.[52] Unfortunately, a few of the constitutional Bishops protested shortly afterwards that when the decrees of absolution were presented to them by Bernier in presence of Portalis, they had refused to accept them and had made no retractation, while others still showed some adherence to their former opinions or at least manifested doubtful sentiments.[53] They were therefore considered as relapsed, and the bulls confirming the canonical institution granted by the Legate were forwarded only to de Montault, Bishop of Angers, and Charrier, Bishop of Versailles, who had a long time previously abandoned the schism. When Pius VII. came to Paris to crown Napoleon Portalis persuaded the others to visit the Holy Father, whose affectionate words at last conquered their obstinacy, and they signed the declaration which was demanded of them, by which they submitted to the judgments of the Holy See and of the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church with regard to the ecclesiastical affairs of France."[54]

On Palm Sunday at Notre Dame the Legate had installed Mgr. de Belloy, former Bishop of Marseilles, as Archbishop of Paris, and, assisted by the former Bishops of Angers and of Saint Papoul, had consecrated the Abbé Cambacérès, brother of the Second Consul, as Archbishop of Rouen, the Abbé Bernier as Bishop of Orleans and the Abbé de Pancemont, parish priest of Saint Sulpice, as Bishop of Vannes.

The Concordat was at last solemnly proclaimed on the morning of Easter Sunday, 18th April, 1802. An address by the First Consul to the French people was posted in every department. It alluded

---

Documents, t. V., No. 1,246, p. 521. Mémoire du Légat sur la reconciliation des éveques constitutionels. Rinieri, I., p. 470. Cardinal Caprara made some verbal changes in the document which the Bishops forwarded to the Holy Father.

[52] Documents, t. V., No. 1,243, p. 503. The "processus" with regard to the Constitutional Bishops took place at various dates in April, May and July, 1802. Doc., t. V., pp. 512, 513, 525.

[53] Padre Rinieri has very carefully examined this obscure question, and is of opinion that there can be no doubt, even from the letters of those who protested that they had not retracted, that they had accepted the changes introduced by the Legate into their letter to the Pope, and that they did not deny explicitly that they had abjured their errors verbally. What they protested was that they had given no inward consent. Rinieri, I., p. 475.

[54] Documents, t. V., No. 1,273. Allocution du Pape en Consistoire, 24 Mai, 1802. Footnote at page 91.

to the outburst of passions, to the religious dissensions and to the civil wars which had been born of the Revolution and had spread disorder throughout society. Religion alone could check this disorder, and recourse was therefore had to the Sovereign Pontiff to obtain by his intervention the reconciliation of opinions and of hearts. At his voice the elements of discord had vanished as well as all the obstacles which malevolence might oppose to peace. The French nation was, therefore, exhorted to be united for the happiness of their country and to consider as their bond of union the religion which had civilized Europe.[55]

In Paris the announcement of the Concordat was accompanied with a display calculated to produce a deep impression on the minds of the people. At an early hour a procession was formed of the principal functionaries of the city, escorted by detachments of cavalry, which passed through the streets and halted at twelve places, at each of which the secretary of the *préfecture de police* read Bonaparte's proclamation and the "Law of the 18th Germinal an X, relating to the organization of public worship," the official title by which the Concordat and the *Articles Organiques* were designated. Large crowds assisted at this demonstration, with every sign of interest and satisfaction, while the canon of *Les Invalides* thundered forth a salute of sixty guns, which was answered by a battery on the *Place du Carrousel.*

The celebration of the feast at Notre Dame was carried out with a splendor such as Paris had not seen since the days of the monarchy. From the Palace of the Tuileries to the Cathedral the streets had been lined with troops, through which passed the long train of generals, statesmen and foreign diplomatists whom the First Consul had invited to attend the ceremony. Many of them, especially his former equals, the generals, were bitterly hostile to the reëstablishment of religion in France, and had attempted to resist, but they had been forced to submit to his strong will. The Ambassadors, too, at first intended to decline the invitation, as it is not the custom for the diplomatic body to accompany a sovereign when going to assist at a religious function, and they also feared that they might not be treated with the respect due to their rank. In the end, however, they thought it more prudent to yield rather than offend a man with such a violent temper as Bonaparte.[56] The procession was headed by the consular guard, composed of picked men, which was soon to change the name for that of the imperial guard. It was followed by the carriages of the Councillors of State, by those of the Ambassadors and of the Ministers. The carriages of the Second and

[55] Documents, t. V., No. 1,252, p. 543. Proclamation du Premier Consul, 17 April, 1802.

Third Consuls, which were filled with their secretaries and friends, preceded that of Bonaparte, which was drawn by eight horses and in which sat the three Consuls, wearing their official uniform of scarlet velvet, trimmed with gold. On each side rode generals who were already celebrated and who were, later on, to become marshals of the empire.

At the door of the Cathedral the Consuls were received by the Archbishop of Paris and his clergy with the same ceremony of the presentation of incense and holy water as was customary under the monarchy. The Consuls took their place under a splendid canopy of crimson velvet and gold opposite the throne on which the Legate sat. The Cardinal then began a Low Mass. After the Gospel twenty-four of the newly appointed Bishops took the oath to the First Consul. A sermon was then preached by the Archbishop of Tours, Mgr. Raymond de Boisgelin, and at the end of the Mass the "Te Deum" of Paesiello, intoned by the Cardinal, was chanted, to the accompaniment of the military bands and of two orchestras, one led by Méhul, the other by Cherubini, the greatest musicians of the day.[57]

After ten years of schism, during which the Church underwent as sanguinary a persecution as any of those inflicted by the Roman Emperors, France was at last officially reconciled to the Church. The First Consul, however, to whom was due the peace enjoyed by the Church, had taken care, both in the Concordat and in the *Articles Organiques,* to forge bonds for the clergy which should impede the freedom of its action on society and render it as much as possible subservient to his will, to be used merely as an instrument for the furtherance of his own interests. This became still more evident under the empire, to the establishment of which all his acts were then tending, and his ambition even led him to prevail on the aged Pius VII. to undertake the long and fatiguing journey to Paris in order to give by his presence greater lustre to the inauguration of the new dynasty.

Donat Sampson.

London, England.

[56] Documents, V., No. 1,263, p. 566. Ph. Cobenzl à Colloredo, Paris, 22 Avril, 1802.

[57] The preceding details on the ceremony at Notre Dame are borrowed from an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of 15 October, 1902, by M. Gilbert Augustin-Thierry.

ENGLAND AND THE SULTAN.

THE party now supreme in Turkey—the Young Turks—has its delegates in the various capitals of Europe to advocate the principles and methods by which it hopes, or pretends to hope, for the reconstruction of the empire in terms of Western civilization and constitutional monarchy. They have been received with interest and sympathy, particularly in London. In other chief towns revolutionaries or patriotic visitors from foreign parts are received in a suspicious or in a business like manner. What may be done with them? How can we turn to profitable account the disaffection they represent? In London the noted assassin and bomb-thrower is welcomed in the drawing rooms of Mayfair and becomes the lady-killer of suburban villas. As we write Ahmed Riza Bey, the Kossuth of Young Turkey, the Gambetta of Young Turkey, is bowing over the hands of Duchesses in Belgravia and his followers are "shooting men" and outraging women in Bulgaria and Anatolia.

We shall be disliked for our slowness in seeing the disappearance of the leopard's spots. English people are emotional. English women hold their bits of lace to nose and eye when a walking sensation from St. Petersburg in the shape of an anarchist, from Cork in the character of an Irish landlord tells his woes. This amiability does not last long if some good reason intervenes; the anarchist may have been discovered pocket-picking, the Italian patriot found with unconsidered trifles from Lady P——'s boudoir,[1] "the gentlemanly Turk," so they called him in London society when he was playing the very devil in Bulgaria in 1876-8, may have proved himself a difficulty to the Minister and a distraction to his wife,[2] and so each and all become confounded foreigners unless indeed the great nobles of Austria-Hungary or Spain or of the Foubourg St. Germaine or of Berlin.

We hope that Ahmed Riza Bey and his fellow-reformers may meet with the suspicion we think wise. Enthusiasts are easily taken in. The young Irelanders praised the Sultan in 1848 for refusing to surrender Kossuth; Irishmen in an aberration were as much devoted to Garibaldi as Lady Palmerston and Lord Shafesbury until their eyes were opened by the Garibaldian riots in Hyde Park.

[1] We speak of Garibaldian times, when Cabinet Ministers and their wives entertained such social outlaws. We must do the Irish landlord justice: he only robs under contract; he does not steal from shops or private houses. He is in bad company, though, with a continental patriot. But why does he affect grievances?

[2] The Turks are a polite people, it is said, and those of the embassy thought English ladies deserved attention.

At any rate our own view is that the Young Turks are and must be the enemies of Christianity, and we refuse to believe that their adoption of constitutional principles has a deeper meaning than the thousand palace revolutions which led to the changes of Ministries in the past and frequently to the deposition or murder of Sultans. Those Englishmen who discover in the policy of Young Turkey an accord with the ideas which are expressed by popular government forget that there never was a period in English history when the sovereign was absolute. Even under the Norman Princes enactments, and particularly those bearing on taxation, were framed with the assent of the Great Council of the kingdom—that body out of which the Houses of Parliament, the Judiciary, the Exchequer, the Privy Council came into being as convenient divisions. The change was not so much a process of evolution as of resolution into the component parts demanded of a governmental system made more complex by the rise of commercial interests, the increase of population and the emergence of more subtle doctrines in the relations of land tenure.

This was the primary condition of European States. It sprang from the Christian principle that the King was not the ruler of the conscience and the rights of his people. He was their protector and the asserter of their rights and the symbol of the supreme law of the State, in which the duties, the obligations and capabilities of each and all were crystallized. Christianity made men free not merely in the spiritual order but because their spiritual freedom demanded as of right the civil liberty to attain it. On the other hand, the Turk is the Sultan's slave, body and soul; his life is an accidental thing in the endless realm of fate, a bubble on the stream, a thistle-down in the wind. He has no sense of moral elevation to be reached, no spiritual destiny to be struggled for. If riches command enjoyment, the world is wide to plunder. He has his horse and his sword, and every man who works is his victim. His "purchase" is in other men's pockets. The wider his conquest extends the greater the spoil. He is a destroyer, with no thought of the morrow. Homes of industries, the town, the city are leveled by him in his pride, fertile lands are laid waste; he passes like the locust over cornfield and vineyard; if he remains in a region, he sits amid the desolation he has made; his narghile and his harem and an occasional head brought to his feet are the business of this life till he crosses the invisible bridge to the seraglio of his paradise beyond.

Think of this conscienceless, voluptuous savage embarking on that parliamentary life which was the life of every State in Europe till the Reformation, which the standing armies of the Reformation killed from the Seine to the Danube, which Reformation Kings

tried to kill in England, but which is the very instrument as well as the language of English liberty.[3] It is the sense of Christian statesmanship which the Church made articulate, which she defended against the Norman's infinite craft and iron hand and Plantagenets' paroxysms of angry pride, and which in the profound legacy of principles she bequeathed to the apostate nation she secured against the ecclesiastico-political despotism of Tudor, the cringing waywardness of James I., the measureless duplicity of Charles I.

It is perfectly clear that as matters stand the appeal to England must be in vain, for her interests are, in appearance, so intimately bound up with the religious influence of the Sultan over the Moslem world, and in addition her commerce with Turkey is so very considerable that she would be ready for a war to defend the existing fragments of the Turkish Empire for the successor and representative of the Prophet.

The Mussulman population of India is sixty millions. They are the bravest, strongest and most energetic of the various races inhabiting that possession. It is true there is great unrest in India at the present moment, but it is mainly to be found among the non-Moslem Bengales and the various approximating forms of heathenism which shade off from Brahmanism to the strange and at one time appalling superstitions of the very remote and desolate mountain spurs of the northeast and the plains of the centre.[4] It may be laid down that the Mahommedans hate all these with the ferocious passion which manifested itself in early days against the Persian Fireworshipers and a little later against the Byzantine Empire. The Mutiny in which the Mahommedans, Hindus and the other races and religions in India joined does not affect my initial proposition. They rose in a wild, savage rebellion because Moslem and Buddhist, Brahman and Rajput were required to bite cartridges that had been steeped in hog fat, to all of them an abomination. But that is a thing never to happen again. The suppression of the mutiny, in a manner as sanguinary and systematic as a massacre of janissaries by a frightened and enraged Sultan or of unreserved prisoners by a Roman imperator, crushed the very heart of that two hundred and forty millions. The favor shown to the great feudatories and their Mussulman subjects has started an interest in the Indian Empire which has some reality, while it has secured for them the jealousy and distrust of all the rest, a strong motive.

There is nothing to prevent a British Ambassador at Constantinople, when the occasion demands, to ask the Commander of the

[3] Parliament—the speaking place of the people.

[4] The Thugs were a recognized religious fraternity until put down, in spite of the Anglo Indians. The abolition of Lutherism was strongly opposed by the same class. The wild "nated men" of the remote northeast are tame to a degree.

Faithful to give the sacred banner to the wind and to issue the mandate for a holy war in favor of his vicegerent in the Frankish lands called the United Kingdom at the boundary of the northern light and of the lands below the earth, where the people walk upon their heads, and Emir of the vast continent between them which His Highness has not yet taken from Edward of Frangestan aforesaid to bestow on his greater subject called the Mikado, at whose hands the most accursed of accursed Giaours met defeat upon sea and land.

One can easily imagine an Irishman like the late Marquis of Dufferin and Ava approaching His Highness the Padisha by frequent genuflections and prostrations, a Donnybrook Fair expression in his eye faint as the ray looking through a winter sky. We can hear him with the volubility of a herald address the Padisha with his long beadroll of titles, including the important fact that all crowns are held from him and that even the terrible old man nearly thirteen hundred years old,[5] whom the Christians worship and whom his viceroy Edward's ancestors deserted to embrace an imperfect form of Mahommedanism, is only a recalcitrant subject of the successor of the Caliphs and the Prophet, who ought to be impaled "to encourage the rest" of the Giaours.

The favor with which the reforms in Turkey have been regarded in England may be analyzed into the expectation that the final dismemberment of that empire's possessions in Europe is indefinitely postponed. The efforts of the Christian populations have never received official countenance in England unless under the special pressure of influences at home too strong for Ministers. This was the case at the time of the Greek rising in 1820, when a war of seven years was allowed to go on until the classic sentiment, strong in cultivated Englishmen, and the principles of the Liberal party, asserted in the *Edinburgh Review* and in Parliament, forced the government to unite with the French and Russian fleets at Navarino. A like policy was pursued up to the Treaty of Berlin. The Sublime Porte had a well-grounded assurance of the support of Lord Beaconsfield. He had been prevented from declaring war against Russia owing to the passions excited by the horrors in Bulgaria, but he could wait upon events, and in the meantime he directed

---

[5] We think it was Timour who asked a Spanish Ambasador: "Was not the Pope an old man nearly five hundred years ago?" We make the Sultan count the Pope's age from the Higera. It is still the conviction of the Sultan's subjects that not only is he king of kings, but each and every potentate receives his state and jurisdiction from him. The hatred of Mahomet II. towards Nicholas V. was truly Turkish. He would conquer Rome and flay the Pope alive, make a saddle of his skin and feed his horse in St. Peter's. This is the true Turk, and not Ahmed Riza Bey.

Indian regiments to be landed in Malta, whence with the greatest ease they could be conveyed to the coast of Epirus. One can hardly conceive the character of a design which would have let loose on Christian peoples regiments fired by the same hates and animated by the same hopes as the Turks themselves. The usages of havoc were an inheritance of the Turk. The country on which or in which he made war was as though visited by Divine vengeance. Attila, Senghis, Timour were instruments of a power which gave into their hands dominion over the laws of nature. Whatever was fair and attractive in domestic and social relations perished when they came. Rivers no longer drained their watersheds, miasmatic marshes spread far and wide from their banks. Populous regions became empty, save where a few pale, tottering men and women emerged from their hiding places when darkness fell to seek whatever might fill the void of an imperious hunger that admitted of no nicety. The Turk was like to these conquerors in all respects except the immediate magnitude of the desolation and misery they caused. He took a longer time to destroy, but his work was, unhappily, more enduring. It is permanent in European Turkey, notwithstanding the intercourse and amenity of European civilization. In Anatolia, once so famed for the possession of all that delights, softens and elevates the intellect and the heart, the Turk is the maleficent spirit that has made man the unhappy creature who, amid his degradation, has the inherited consciousness of greatness in thought and action amid scenes worthy the highest energies of mind and heart. Wherever he has sat down the Turk and his hordes have been at war with Providence for the possession of man's life and the good things which bless it. To this predestinated criminal Lord Beaconsfield's policy would have given an ally fit for the office by traditions in his own country more appalling in their subtle and calculating cruelty than the blunt, primitive ferocity of the Turk. Why, those men so accomplished in the arts which cause suffering, who did the work of Warren Hastings, were natives or the disciples of natives. They had nothing to learn from powers that preside over torture in all its varying forms, but this is not all. They could destroy on a scale as magnificent as Apollyon's or the three great conquerors we have named. Often and often down to the historic waste of the Carnatic Indian conquerors and potentates were as powers of nature in their destroying force, guided by a profound and foreseeing intelligence from which nothing escaped or could escape.

As an instance out of a history made up of instances of fraud and mendacity, the Sultan's advisers and himself would, if they could, have betrayed Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury to the contempt of the Western Powers after signing the Treaty of Berlin.

It must be borne in mind that the Russian armies had reached Constantinople at the time. The Turkish army was in fragments when swept from the earthworks of Plevna, the army in Asia beaten to its knees, the European army demoralized and in pieces, notwithstanding the admirable defense it had made at Plevna. Russia, through England's interposition with a threat, abandoned her advantages. The taking of Constantinople was a work of no difficulty for Russia then. It would not be the task which Mahomet II. accomplished when the last Paleoligus died at the Great Gate fighting desperately at the head of a few Greeks and a few Genoese after a siege of exceptional vigor between enormously disproportioned forces and a besieging artillery incomparably superior in bore and power to that of the city.

In 1878 the various Christian groups in Constantinople—Greeks, Armenians, Sclavs from the Balkan provinces, Græco-Slavs of Servia—were more numerous than the Mahommedans, and all of them to a man would have joined the Russians in their attack. We do not say that the Mahommedans were cowed to that degree which refuses to face a victorious enemy, but they believed that their European empire was at an end, and they accepted the destiny with Oriental indifference or resignation. From the first days of their occupation of the European part of the Greek Empire the Turks were filled with the idea and handed it down as a tradition that their stay in Europe would not be a long one. In accordance with the sentiment that for them Europe afforded no final resting place they buried their dead on the eastern side of the Bosphorus. The time of their going out had come, it seemed to them, in 1878, and not for the first time, but the English Government stood in the way and concluded a shameful treaty which, amid the mockery of Europe, that bizarre and Oriental intelligence, Lord Beaconsfield, gave to the bankers and merchants of the city, the squires and farmers of the rural districts, the swashbucklers of the jingo press as a political war-chy "Peace with Honor!" a treaty of peace with honor he called the most conspicuous defeat in the annals of diplomacy.

Peace with honor! Well, for a Christian State to take the part of Turkey against her Christian subjects, tens of thousands of them at the very moment enriching the soil with so much of their remains as escaped beasts and birds of prey; tens of thousands of the daughters of them carried into Oriental captivity; tens of thousands of the children of them brought to the slave market for a rich man in the capital, when the Padisha's fifth had been deducted, for a rich man in Anatolia, a rich man in the Persian borders, a rich man in Arabia at the east, Morocco at the west—for a Christian State, we say, to uphold on the verge of the abyss such a power would have been a

turpitude to describe which no language is adequate even if some enormous material advantage were the reward. But it had not even the merit of a great and profitable infamy. The Sultan reaped some slight concessions, which diminished his humiliation, though he lost considerable territory in Europe and Asia. At any rate he was saved; but while England was cheering over the peace, His Highness refused to ratify the treaty until the British fleet sailed into Dulcigno. Peace and honor! A peace to be enforced on the protegè by another Navarino.

One of the difficulties of the moment is the attitude of Servia, a State of which one desires to speak with a certain tenderness. We cannot forget that the massacres in the Lebanon in 1860 caused Servia to give the example to the Christian provinces of European Turkey to rise against the enemy of the Christian name, the enemy of the home, the enemy of all that gives light to life. Notwithstanding the abandonment of the Christians by Austria and France under the influence and scarcely veiled threats of England, Roumania was formed out of the two provinces thitherto known as Moldavia and Wallachia by the impetus imparted from the Servian insurrection. Bosnia and Montenegro sprang to arms. Crete, that island which the Turkish official regarded as his delectable land, for he was master of life and property and honor in man and woman, however low he might be in rank, turned with claw and tooth on the power that maintained him.[6] One by one the process of breaking away on the part of the Danubian and other provinces of Turkey in Europe has proceeded. Never has England by her Tory Ministers spoken for their freedom except when enthusiasts like Byron and the great Christian statesman who restored the Ionian Isles excited against them that love of liberty and justice to be found among the English masses and the sections of Nonconformity in which ignorance of mundane learning is not patronized. There were advocates for the retention of the Ionian Islands. We pass them by. There were advocates for the handing over of them to the Sultan instead of to Greece, and these last are the men who would be Moslems or Hindus, whichever paid in India, who would be fetish worshipers at Cape Coast Castle and follow for a consideration the lead of a vulgar, ignorant polemic like Mr. Kensit in London.

With a great Liberal majority it is not unreasonable to expect that a regard for the aspirations of all the Christian peoples in European

[6] Before the massacre of the janissaries by Mahmud II., detachments from them governed Crete. Nothing but the imagination which conceived Swift's "Modest Proposal" could tell what this rule meant. England has steadily opposed the diplomacy of Europe, which would alleviate the oppression of the island.

Turkey shall be maintained. One cannot conceive a member of the present Cabinet lamenting over the victory in 1827, which secured a modicum of liberty to Greece and a grudging extent of territory, lamenting, we say, an English victory in the cause of reason, justice and humanity as "an untoward event." So spoke a Tory Prime Minister in 1827, the Duke of Wellington. The whole Tory party was of a like mind in 1878. It has not changed its view in 1908, for its leader in the House of Lords laughed at the idea of massacres in Macedonia. Its ephemeral publications and its heavy encyclopedias are ever charged with contrasts between the Turks and their Christian subjects, to the favor of the first. The Christian is false and treacherous, the Turk open and truthful, according to these dishonored prints. If an outbreak occurs anywhere, the Christians were the aggressors; if proof irresistible as fate is given that in any quarter of the Sultan's dominions Christians suffered horrors worse than death, the apologetic answer is that they brought it on themselves. This is what we are told by the publicists and orators of England.

The monotony of such denials and apologies is not merely tiresome; it forces one to think he is under the spell of some demon which compels him to regard nameless wrongs as acts of administrative necessity, robbery as justice, murder as exuberance of spirits, just as an amiable man,[7] corrupted by the Orangemen of Ireland, regarded the murder of a nun in Ulster.

The lands may be tilled, but the harvest is gathered by the spoiler. One might venture even under this nightmare of mendacity to suggest that the course is economically unsound which deprives the cultivator of his inducement to labor. Yet this has been the dealing of the Turks with their Christian subjects during the centuries they ruled from the Euphrates to the Danube, from Hungary to Cape Matapan.

The pasture lands might under particular conditions of repose be stocked with sheep and black cattle, but the Mahommedan neighbor's fields were bare, so the latter appealed to the bim-bashi and his bashi-bazouks and the Christians' pastures were emptied as when they first rose from the Flood. We change the order. The crops in the first stage of growing were visited by the tax collector and his zaptiehs. The crops belonged to Christians exclusively, for "the gentlemanly Turk" toiled not, and the tax was paid as the price of permitting them to reach maturity. Before the ripening they were again visited, and again money or security passed to allow the beneficent powers of nature to do their work. Again when the

[7] Lord Iddesleigh spoke of Orangemen firing volleys near a convent as done in gaiety of heart.

sickle was in the corn the collector came and seized all, because he had made a mistake in his estimate of the returns. In vain the occupier might protest; the State—which meant the collector and his followers—should not suffer loss. The despoiled Christian inherited this bondage from his fathers.

Then from another point of the horizon came the mudir and his household army. Horses, silks, satins, whatever had escaped the collector, were carried off. Later on the pacha or the camaican came or sent for their shares, but as there were no other spoils left from the gleanings of the first visitors, maidens for these important officers, together with children for the slave market, were seized upon, and up to 1828 boys in infancy, collected like the tithes of lambs in another country, were taken from their parents for the renewal of that famous corps, the janissaries. The tributes wrung from weakness and despair by the Sultan's officers and His Highness are told in part in this page. The record of a day of distress and shame, of ruined homes, of murdered men and undone women is the record of each hour since the Turk started on his mission against Christ.

In the face of such a story expediencies of policy cannot justify the conscience of the English people. England has bound herself to protect the Sultan's possessions in Asia. We have not the time and we do not desire the space to consider this engagement. It is morally indefensible unless indeed a commission with sufficient power to protect the Christians throughout that large area should be appointed. As we have said, the considerations attending this political attitude are too complex to be discussed at the end of a paper. We shall simply return to the line we have taken, namely, to say that as province after province has crumbled away from the Sultan's rule in Europe; that as all his people and the traditions of the House of Osman itself, so far as they were permitted to pass Seraglio Point in the pupilage of any prince that ever succeeded to the throne or escaped the bow-string, bear testimony to a belief, or a judgment, or some racial intuition that the Turk's stay in Europe was from the first destined to be only temporary, the fulfillment of that destiny which is in reality the Nemesis of accumulated crimes crying to heaven for vengeance, should be accomplished by the European Powers.

Mahommedan instincts, passions, modes of thought are incompatible with Christianity. The Turkish mind itself is incapable of civilization as we understand it. Let there be no confusion; let no one speak of the Moors in Spain, of the Syrians, who gave a polished splendor to the court of the Caliphs. If you withdraw from the Turk the control of irresponsible power which holds him to a

locality, the necessity of even that primitive organization which binds together the units of a savage army against enemies, you will find him a Tartar horseman, speeding from dawn to sunset in his raids of robbery and massacre, cooking under his saddle the steaks cut from the living cow, drinking in the teeth of the Koran the kumiss of his ancestors, sleeping off in his black tent the effects of the meat he has eaten beyond repletion and the drink he has quaffed to intoxication.

It is for such a monster England forgets Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the reign of an ever broadening law, the purity of domestic life, the justice of public life.

GEORGE MCDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

DANTE AS A TEACHER AND PREACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

"THE central man of all the world," according to Mr. Ruskin, "as representing the imaginative, moral and intellectual faculties all at their highest is Dante."[1] It is not the purpose of this paper to treat of Dante as a poet, pointing out his rare felicity of language, the beauty of his poetic similes, the many delicate touches which show his keen and loving observation of nature—for instance, his accurate descriptions of the tender hues of the dawn, the delicate tints of flowers and herbage, the radiant beauty of his angels in the "Purgatorio." What in the whole range of literature is there to equal the poetic beauty of the Earthly Paradise?—Matilda culling flowers on the banks of the stream, the glorious pageant in which appears the triumphal chariot representing the Church, accompanied by the seven allegorical virtues, the twenty-four Elders and the four Gospel Beasts described by Ezekiel and St. John. And how shall we follow the poet as he wings his flight into the Empyrean, the highest heaven? Words are feeble to express the keenness and subtlety of his vision as he describes for us the glories of Paradise. No uninspired writer approaches him in sublimity as he tells of the angelic hierarchies, the hosts of the redeemed, Free Will and other deep things of God.

Then, too, any account of the poet as poet must take into consideration the technique of his verse—the *terza rima* of the "Commedia," the construction of the three *cantiche* of the poem and the exquisite structural symmetry and correspondences of the sonnets and canzoni of the "Vita Nuova."

---

[1] Stones of V. 3 s. 67.

Touching for a moment or two only upon the intellectual faculties of Dante, rated so high by Mr. Ruskin, we note that our poet was master of all the learning of his time—indeed, that the range of his learning was encyclopædic. We know from the evidence afforded by his works, especially the "Commedia" and the "Convivio," how intimate was his knowledge of Aristotle, *"ill maestro di color che sanno,"* the master of those that know; of Vergil, his dear guide and more than father; of Thomas Aquinas, the great scholastic philosopher. We know that he studied for his degree at Paris, then famous for its schools of theology and philosophy. I for one should be glad to believe as firmly as does Dean Plumptree that Dante studied at Oxford.[2]

But besides all the learning of the schools and of antiquity, we know that Dante was keenly interested in problems of physical science. It would seem from many passages in his books that he had some premonition of the theory of gravitation. In many other passages there are references to the influence of the sun and moon on the tides, while in the latest years of his life he busied himself with the question of land and water on the earth. We know, too, that the laws of the refraction of light possessed for him a keen fascination.

But it is not the intellectual quality nor yet the poetical or imaginative quality in the "Divina Commedia" that makes it the great force, the power in men's lives that it is. We all remember De Quincey's distinction between the literature of knowledge and the literature of power. Thought without feeling gives us science; thought interpenetrated with feeling gives us literature. It was because Dante had felt much as well as thought much, had felt with all the intensity of his passionate, sensitive nature, had felt the loss of all things dear unto him, had proved how salt is the taste of another's bread—ah me—*"si come sa di sale lo pane altrui,"* how hard the path to go up and down another's stair—had felt the longing homesickness of exile, the bitter pains and humiliations of poverty—it was because of all these experiences of life that he was able to project his heart and soul into the poem which Tieck calls a "mystic, unfathomable song."

To quote from Scartazzini: "A consummate artist, he turned to account experience and fortune, character and morals, joy and sorrow, love and hatred, virtue and vice, life and death and added thereto the collected wisdom of his age."

---

[2] The only authority for this fact is a passage in the commentary of John of Serravalle, who translated the Commedia into Latin. Two copies only of this are in existence, one in the library of the Vatican, the other in the British Museum.

Unlike Homer and Shakespeare, who had the rare power of detaching themselves from and of standing outside of their work as it were, he impressed his own individuality upon his great poem, especially upon the "Purgatorio," until it reads in some measure as his autobiography.

And so it is that this great poem that made Dante lean for many a year has its message for us in the twentieth century, because it is the history of a human soul in its moral warfare—the flesh, the world and the devil in league against it, and sometimes baffling its efforts in its progress upwards to reach the highest good.

Carlyle tells us that if all had gone well with Dante in Florence, if he had been Podestà, had been well accepted with his neighbors, the world would have wanted this song of his. But years before this he had deliberately resolved after the death of Beatrice, in 1290, that if his life should be spared he would write of her, the "glorious lady of his mind," what had never yet been written of any woman. It is incontestable that much of the depth of feeling, the dramatic intensity of the "Divina Commedia," many of the terrible episodes of the "Inferno" are directly traceable to the violent political feuds of the time, in which Dante as a citizen of Florence was unhappily involved. But the year 1300 had in some way been a turning-point in the poet's life. This is the assumed date of the poem—*"Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita"*—"Midway in the path of this our life." Dante, born in 1265, had now reached the age of thirty-five, half the span of years allotted to man by the Psalmist. In his vision he finds himself in the midst of a dark wood. Some interpret this by saying that Dante had fallen into loose and immoral ways. Dante himself says in the "Convivio" that to comfort himself for the loss of Beatrice he had betaken himself to the study of philosophy in the writings of Cicero and Boethius, and so enamored did he become of this new study, which he represents under the guise of a "noble lady," that he forsook the study of theology, by which we are to understand his devotion to Beatrice. Difficulties confront us whichever way we look at the passage. Some explain it by saying that the poet wandered from the true faith and lost his way in the mazes of doubt. We are reminded of the dictum of Tennyson:

> There lives more faith in honest doubt,
> Believe me, than in half the creeds.

At any rate, when the weary pilgrim has attained the summit of the Mount of Purification, Beatrice sternly rebukes him for turning "his steps by a way not true."

And so, guided by Vergil, symbol of human reason, Dante takes his way through the different circles of the pit of hell till he arrives at the point furthest away from God, where, imbedded in ice, is

Lucifer, once the most beautiful and most glorious of God's creatures, "nobler far than any other creature," are Dante's own words.

It is to show "the exceeding sinfulness of sin," its heinousness, nay, its foulness, that Dante, now in words rough and raucous, again by imagery most grotesque and horrible, pictures the deed and its symbolic punishment.

In C. xi. of the "Inferno" Vergil explains to Dante the nature of sin. All sins may be divided into (1) those of incontinence, (2) those of bestiality or violence, (3) those of malice or fraud. The incontinent—that is, the carnal minded, the gluttonous, the avaricious and prodigal—sin from want of self-control, from impulses which have not yet hardened into habits. They are less displeasing to God, and so their punishment is less severe than that meted out to sins of the reason and the will. "The good of the intellect," says Thomas Aquinas, "is the knowledge of God, which is the true beatitude of every human soul." So the perversion of the intellect, the using of the powers of the mind to do violence to God or to one's neighbor involves the soul in a fearful responsibility and drags it down ever lower and lower.

Indulgence in sin degrades the soul till the body which inhabits becomes brutish like the beasts.. The greatest sinners are traitors—traitors to God and country. Accordingly Judas, the betrayer of Christ; Brutus and Cassius, slayers of Cæsar, are placed in the lowest pit, continually flayed and champed upon by Satan.

There is a certain correspondence between the sin and its punishment. The carnal minded are swayed along by a fierce whirlwind, as they were moved on earth by the restlessness of their evil desires. The gluttons wallow in mud, their bodies distorted by the indulgence of their appetites, their minds darkened. Descending much further, we come upon the evil counsellors, who, as they sinned with their tongues, are imprisoned within a tongue of fire in the very heart of hell. The barrators, those who make a traffic in places of public trust and who sell justice for money, are immersed in pitch, symbol of the clinging, defiling power of money when gained by dishonest, unholy means. Dante was an idealist in civil government as he was in ecclesiastical polity, and in describing the politicians and unjust judges of the early part of the fourteenth century he spares no scornful epithets. Indeed, the canto in which they appear is the hardest to read in the whole "Inferno."

It is greatly to be regretted that so many who begin with the "Inferno" there stop short, deterred from reading further by the disagreeable impressions received from the horrible scenes of violence in the lower circles of the dolorous realm. Many, too, gain

all their knowledge of Dante from the illustrations of Doré, who was incapable of the spiritual insight necessary to an understanding of Dante's poem. They miss entirely the sweetness and noble-mindedness of the poet's nature who judge him by the "Inferno" only. Stern and inflexible when dealing with obdurate, hardened sinners, the tenderness of his nature is displayed in innumerable touches throughout the whole poem. His expressions of filial regard towards Vergil, the many instances in which he brings in as illustration the tender devotion of a mother's love are proof of this, without mentioning the deathlike swoon into which the poet fell at the recital of poor Francesca's pitiful tale. What can exceed the pathos and tenderness of that touch as he describes the lonely death of Buonconte da Montefeltro on the banks of a little stream flowing into the Arno. His last cry was to Mary, Mother of Mercy. God's angel took him while one from hell contended with him, but lost, and all for the sake of "one little tear"—*"per una lagrimetta."*[3]

Dante, one day walking through the streets of Verona, heard some women talking together. "See," said one, "there is the man who has been in hell." "Ah, yes," said the other; "that is the reason, then, that his hair is so singed and his skin so dark." Yes, many who have followed Dante through all the narrowing, converging circles of the lower realm have failed to climb with him the long stairway of the Mount of Purification, have not mounted with him from one heaven to another till the highest blessedness is reached.

Hell is the place where are shown the effects of love distorted; here no prayer or hymn is heard; the blessed names of Jesus and Mary are never pronounced; all is darkness. When we reach the shores of Purgatory all is changed. Here is the place where love, perverted, defective or excessive, is purified. Purgatory is the symbol of our whole life; we are shown the continual struggle that must be maintained before we reach that state of sinlessness lost by our first parents, here typified by the Earthly Paradise. By continued penance or suffering we gain the victory over the besetting sin, until at last, after being drawn through the waters of Lethe—forgetfulness—and drinking of Eunoë, we are made pure and ready to mount to the stars. Let it not be understood for a moment that the office of the Christ as Redeemer is minimized. It is through the virtue of His redeeming grace that the fainting pilgrim is enabled to tread the weary round of the successive and ever receding cornices and mount to the next, when the angel erases from the brow the sign or seal of sin. Instead of sighs, groans, revilings, blasphemies, here are heard the prayers and offices of the Church; courteous accents

[3] Purg., v. 107.

greet the ear, kindly offers of helpfulness are tendered that other, later comers perhaps, may go on their way.

Coming upon the shores of Ante-Purgatory, from the black night of hell, the tender hues of dawn gladden the sight—"the sweet hue of orient sapphire." Night follows the day only to refresh the wearied spirits of the penitents. In hell progress, with the exception of but on one or two occasions, was to the left; here the penitents turn to the right in ascending the mountain. Note the significance even of this.

The pains and penalties are symbolic, corresponding to the sin to be purged. The proud bear heavy weights, and so are bowed to the ground, where in the rock are graven instances or examples of pride brought low. The envious have sinned by means of their eyes, and so their eyelids are sewn together; the color of the rock which girds their cornice is livid. The slothful, several cornices higher up on the side of the mountain, rush by, to show their zeal and haste to make amends for their want of zeal in the former life, asking pardon for their rudeness in not slackening their pace while answering Vergil's question. Here it may be remarked that Vergil, the dear, sweet guide, has just finished discoursing upon the moral system of Purgatory, based upon a saying of Jacopone da Todi: "Set love in order, thou that lovest me."[4]

There are several episodes of great beauty in the "Purgatorio." The story of Buonconte has already been alluded to. There is the story of Pia, whom we meet with in the same cornice (Ante-Purgatory). In Ante-Purgatory Dante meets Casella and asks him to grant the solace of a song, as he was wont in the sweet world below. Further on the poets meet with Sordello, and into his mouth Dante puts the stinging, scathing rebuke to Italy which we find in the sixth canto.

Still further up, indeed, near the end of the toilsome journey (twenty-first), Statius, the Roman poet, is encountered, and here are some of the many delightfully human touches in this "Cantica." I must not omit to mention the idyllic vale of the Princes in the Ante-Purgatory.

I think it was Dean Stanley who said that he considered the "Purgatorio" the most religious book in the world—this he meant most likely excepting the Bible. I, for my part, have no hesitation in putting it above the "St. Thomas à Kempis" or the "Confessions" of St. Augustine. Indeed, the whole "Purgatorio" seems but an expansion of that famous passage of the "Confessions:"[5] *"Fecisti nos ad te, Domine, et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in*

[4] Purg., Seventeenth and Eighteenth C.
[5] Lib. II.

te"—Thou hast made us for Thyself, O Lord, and we can find no rest until we rest in Thee.

Dante himself claimed the title of the Poet of Righteousness,[6] and surely he has made good the claim. As we read the "Paradiso," passing from one heaven to another, we hear through him as he discourses with the Doctors of the Church, saints and Apostles, of faith, love, good works. Mr. Ruskin has remarked that this part of the "Divina Commedia" "is only less read than the 'Inferno' because it requires far greater attention and perhaps a holier heart."[7] "It is a perpetual hymn of everlasting love," says Shelley; "the most glorious imagination of modern poetry."[8]

What a conception of peace, harmony and perfect resignation to God's will that should rule in the hearts of all His creatures is that expressed by Piccarda in that "simple but perfect line," as styled by Matthew Arnold: *"E la sua volontade è nostra pace"*—"And His will is our peace."

The tone and spirit of these words is subdued. Dante in these last years of his life was becoming less denunciatory and vehement in his wrath than in the earlier years of his exile. Still there are other passages in the "Paradiso" where he arraigns Popes and others in high places for their wickedness. Early in life he had adopted the imagery of the Hebrew prophets and had formed his style upon theirs. Especially is this to be noted in his letters addressed to various princes and cities of Italy. Ezekiel and Jeremiah are his favorite prophets. Dante was ever a close student of the Bible. Dr. Edward Moore, one of the foremost Dante scholars in England, has collated over five hundred passages in which Dante has quoted directly or indirectly from it. It is because of the prophetic character of Dante's works that he belongs to all time. Not only to his own age, but to this, when the consciousness of sin is less keenly felt, when greed for money and neglect of the spiritual things of life are marked characteristics, he has a profound message. He is the guide and consoler of those who would live in the spirit[9] even more than Marcus Aurelius, for the one is ethical in his teaching, while the other is profoundly religious.

The late Bishop of Ripon wrote: "The study of Dante, to those who undertake it sincerely, is not merely an interesting recreation; it is a passion; it absorbs; . . . it arouses, incites, gladdens," and Mr. Gladstone: "The reading of Dante is not merely a pleasure —it is a vigorous discipline for the heart, the intellect, the whole man."

[6] Vulg. Elo., II., 2.
[7] St. of Vinier, II., 324.
[8] "Def. of Poetry."
[9] M. Arnold, Ess. on Emerson.

We learn from the lately published "Life of Mr. Gladstone," by Morley, that upon his engagement to Mrs. Gladstone the two adopted as "canons" to direct their lives these passages from the "Paradiso:"

> As for the leaves that in the garden bloom,
> My love for them is great, as is the good
> Dealt by the Eternal hand, that tends them still.
> —Cary, CXXVI.

and

> His will is our peace:
> It is the mighty ocean, whither tends
> Whatever it creates, and nature makes.
> —Cary, Para., C. III., 85.

And that we may not neglect the testimony of our own poets, Lowell says of this supreme poet that he is "a spur to noble aims," "a secure refuge in that defeat which the present always seems; that they prize Dante most who know and love him best. He is not merely a great poet, but an influence, part of the soul's resource in time of trouble."

Silvio Pellico, in the harsh rigors of an Austrian prison, upheld his soul on the sustenance he gained from two books, his only companions—the Bible and the "Divina Commedia."

It has been frequently remarked how passionate is the devotion, how intense the personal affection which Dante inspires in the hearts of those who know him through his works. There is nothing like it in all literature.

M. Lloyd.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE GODDESS OF REASON "IN LOCO PARENTIS."

SINCE the effectuation of the cleavage between Church and State in France, by means of the process called the Law of Separation, the general immediate effect of the change involved upon the fortunes of the whole community was a problem that could not be readily determined, since the gathering of particulars and statistics is a slow and laborious process. One may never know exactly what the change signified in its financial aspect, so immense were the values in property and stipends of the interests affected. Neither can we expect reasonably to ascertain the moral effect of the transformation from a religious system of instruction

of the young to a secular or rather pagan one; nor the physical results of a similar alteration in the systems of hospital and asylum relief to the sick, the injured, the orphaned and the age-disabled. It may be several years ere the full effects of the secular revolution, in these and other particulars, may be fully revealed to the social inquirer and the historian-moralist. Meanwhile, however, some help toward forming a judgment on the depth and nature of the wound inflicted on the body corporal and moral of the French nation is available in the statistics collected by our own authorities in the United States. In the Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1907 very remarkable results are already shown. To the French Government they ought to be alarming, were it a government imbued with the ordinary sense of responsibility for the welfare of the people over whose fortunes, in the mysterious dispensations of Almighty God, it has been permitted for a season to preside. But ever since the apotheosis of the Goddess of Reason the century and more that supervened has shown that "salus populi suprema lex" is a mere figment in France with republican governments no less than imperial. For "the people" there is no more real consideration with the politicians of those two parties than with American ones of the original Vanderbilt brand, as represented in accepted American folklore.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the important matter dealt with in this report, it is incumbent on us to acknowledge the sense of impartiality with which the work of the Bureau is permeated, in the documents it annually presents for the information of Congress and the people at large. There is no suggestion of bias either religious or political in the language or the arrangement of the reports. Some years ago Catholics had reason to complain that no mention of what their voluntarily-supported schools were doing in the public service here, without any State assistance, was ever made in returns that ought to cover the whole field, but when the omission was pointed out to Dr. Harris, the late Commissioner, he lost no time in rectifying the mistake. Dr. Harris' successor, Dr. Elmer Ellsworth Brown, seems to have inherited Dr. Harris' principle of abstention from polemics in the survey of educational conditions at home and abroad. In his case the observance of the rule has become a matter demanding great delicacy of judgment inasmuch as the situation in France has undergone a complete transformation since Dr. Harris' retirement, and the "separation of Church and State" has been construed as a war upon the Church by the State, and especially in regard to the domain of education.

In treating of the present condition of education in the French Republic the utmost care was necessary to avoid hurting the feelings

of Catholics or the *amour propre* of the French Government; and this care has been shown all through the fifty pages which are devoted to the subject in the first volume of the Report referred to.

Centralization is the grand feature of the system of public education in France, as begun in 1833, under the administration of M. Guizot and perfected in 1899, under the present Republic, by the decree prohibiting the appointment of clerical teachers. The commune is taken as the school unit. Each commune or village is by law required to furnish at least one public primary school, and maintain it, but it has not authority over it; this power is claimed and exercised by the State, who appoints the teacher and pays his salary, just as it does that of the general or the admiral as well as the gendarme. The teacher is, then, the helpless servant of the State, and must entirely conform to its orders. This is a peculiar development of the conception of liberty in a great "free" Republic, it must be owned. It is enough honor for the ordinary citizen to pay his share of the taxation which supports the teachers; he has no more voice in the appointment of the people who are to teach his children what the State decides they ought to be taught than the natives of Labrador. In cities having a population amounting to more than one hundred and fifty thousand the schools are under local control, but the teachers are under no control but that of the central authority in Paris. This authority is delegated by the President to the respective Prefects in the ninety departments into which the whole territory of France is divided. The Prefect in each department is the "live wire" that connects the school with the politics of the Republic, whatever these may be for the time being. But it is a vicious thing for politics to have any influence on the course of public education, whether a republican government or a monarchial government be charged with the destinies of any country. And it is all the more vicious in a country like France, wherein centralization of authority has been brought to a perfection as nice as that seen in the launching of a great battleship by the mere pressing of a button by the gloved hand of a pretty girl holding a bouquet. The Prefecturate is the great working apparatus of the government in France, whether it be republican or otherwise, for its members are the absolute tools of the regime in power, and their decrees as absolute and irrevocable as those of the Pharaohs. The mode in which the machinery of education operates is thus described in the United States Commissioners' Report now under notice:

"The civil head of a department and the head also of its school affairs is the Prefect, appointed by the President of the Republic, and the only political official in the long series of those who pertain to the State teaching service. Around his prerogatives—especially

the most important prerogative of appointing teachers (law of March 15, 1850)—is waged a perpetual conflict, but so far with the result only of limiting his power by the advisory functions of the academy inspector and the departmental council of public instruction. (Law of October 30, 1886.) The council has disciplinary powers over teachers, but in case of dismissal or other severe penalty the teacher has the right of appeal to the superior council. The academy inspector submits, as a rule, the propositions upon which the decisions of the council and the executive orders of the Prefect are based. This official is, in general, the controlling spirit in the administration of primary schools. He is assisted by a corps of primary inspectors."

Much care was bestowed by the present government on the preparations necessary to insure success ere it entered on the war against religion, and on the teaching staff its hopes were fondly centred. These hopes seem to have been dashed, to a considerable extent, by the results so far ascertained. We again quote from the Commissioner's Report:

"Teachers belong to the civil service, and to them is intrusted not only the elementary instruction of the people, but the responsibility of inspiring in them a sentiment of deep devotion to the Republic. Until a very recent date the zeal of the teachers in this great national effort had all the ardor of a religious crusade. . . .

"Recalling the conditions of the nation when the present Republic entered upon its work and the share which the teachers have borne in its establishment, it is easy to understand that they were for a long time sustained by an artificial stimulus. Now that normal conditions of order and tranquility prevail, the problem of maintaining an adequate and competent teaching force for the primary schools is more nearly identical with the same problem in other countries. A decline in enthusiasm on the part of the teachers was inevitable. The decline in the number of applicants for admission to the normal schools and to the teaching service is due in most part to a cause that operates in all countries, namely, the superior attractions of other careers as regards salary and social advancement.

"An additional cause of discontent on the part of teachers is undoubtedly found in the spread among them of socialistic doctrines and the consequent increase in official restrictions. The conditions in this respect are illustrated by the recent dismissal of a teacher in a school of Paris, who, as secretary of the Federation of Teachers' Unions, had signed a letter of protest in behalf of trade unions addressed to the Premier.

"In support of his action in this case Minister Briand declared that there could be no assimilation between labor unions and members

of the civil service; and he carefully discriminated between the state of dependence and uncertainty in which workmen subject to the will of a single patron live, and the security of the public functionary whose entire life, including provision for old age, is regulated by the State."

M. Briand was very careful to avoid pushing the comparison to the point wherein the relation of the teacher to the Prefect, in the rural departments of France, might be cited in ironical confirmation of his picture of a woful condition for the general weal. He is a very judicious Minister of Instruction and Public Worship.

It is evident that only a *succes d'estime* has so far attended the great experiment of making the entire educational system of a country of nearly forty millions of people dependent on the decision of a single individual and the working of the automatic button-started machinery. M. Jules Simon was probably the ablest of the anti-religious Education Ministers whom France has had in modern times, and he said, in a letter on the subject of school reform in 1872: "I should wish that every reform demanded of me should emanate from those who have passed their lives in considering and practising the work of instruction; that it should arise from common experiences instead of being imposed by a single will." The government of M. Clemenceau believes and acts otherwise. M. Briand believes his will is a solvent for all educational troubles, and he carries it out by simply pressing the button all over France. But the process does not appear to afford entire satisfaction when it comes to be examined as to its results.

By a very striking coincidence the subject of educational readjustment was engaging the attention of the ruling powers in Germany about the same time that it was perturbing the minds of statesmen in France. A new law recently passed the Prussian Parliament whose effect is practically to revolutionize the old system. Its cardinal principle is the very antithesis of that of the French legislation. It is decentralization. Summarizing the meaning and the anticipated effects of the law, the Commissioner's Report says:

"While formerly the schools and teachers of Prussia were subject to the dictates of the Royal Minister of Public Instruction, the entire external condition and the character of the schools have now been determined by a law agreed upon by the conservative forces of the kingdom, which at that time had the majority in Parliament. The bill before its passage was opposed by the radical elements. Yet, despite the vigorous opposition the bill met with in Parliament, in the press and in educational meetings, all the elements of the State now seem to unite in their loyalty to the law. It is reported from all quarters of the kingdom that the adjustment of conditions of

former years to the present legal requirements is going on undisturbed and smoothly, as befits law-abiding communities."

Let us now return to the working of the law of separation in France and see in how far it inures to the general welfare or whether it meets the expectations of those who devised it and carried it into effect. We can best do this by means of the comparative tables. Let us begin with the primary schools. The total enrollment in these, exclusive of the infant schools, for the year 1900-01 was 5,530,232, which was equivalent to 14.19 per cent. of the total population. In the year 1905, the latest covered by official survey, the total enrollment, again excluding the infant school figures, was 5,568,030. These figures would seem to show that an increase of nearly 38,000 had been effected within the five years comprised between the respective dates. The figures are practically worthless, as the evidence of several Parliamentary Commissions shows. A very large proportion of the total enrollment (28.5 per cent.) prior to the taking of the census for the year 1905 was that which covered the private schools taught by the religious orders. When the latest law came into effect, two years ago, these schools had ceased to exist, and the pupils were absorbed in the general public system. To make it appear that the violent change had produced no perceptible disturbance in the scholastic sphere, great exertions were made, it would seem, to have the figures as to enrollment show an increase proportionate to the growth of the population during the period between the dates given. It must not be left out of sight that the law as to school attendance in France is a compulsory one, yet previous to the recent legislation it was ineffectual to compel the attendance of children in many of the departments. M. Maurice Faure, the Deputy appointed to draw up a report on the subject, in 1902, said: "The obligatory law is ignored or partially evaded in many communes. . . . Legislation seems to have failed of its purpose, probably because at first its application was neglected by the authorities, who failed to realize that if they were negligent at the outset they would hardly have the face to insist later that parents should perform this new duty. The school committees, which are composed by the joint action of the municipal councils and the academy inspector and of members designated by the law, are of little account. Complaint had been made that the local members of the committees are too often indifferent and sometimes even hostile to the public schools."

Great efforts, seemingly, have been put forth to make it appear that the shutting out of the religious orders has made no change for the worse in the case of the primary schools, so far as the matter of enrollment was concerned. But enrollment is one thing; attend-

ance is the real test of the efficacy of any compulsory school law. In regard to this test the official reports are silent, and so the reader seeking information has got to read between the lines and draw his own deductions from omission of reference as to attendance or evidences of failure, as in the case of the complaint of M. Couyba, chairman of the Financial Committee of the Chamber of Deputies, that "while the school enrollment increases the number of illiterates remains stationary. Moreover, among the literate are included young people who are only able to read a little, or who can barely make the letters of their names. The Republic cannot be satisfied with this meager result." Reorganization of the local school committees, which are specially charged to look after the school attendance of the children of their respective communities and to report violations of the law, is urged by M. Couyba. These commissions, however, have no actual authority, and hence in the exercise of their duty with respect to delinquent children they simply incur the enmity of the parents. In brief, the compulsory system fails for want of adequate means for the enforcement of the law. So that little value attaches to statistics of school enrollment.

Desperate efforts had been made by the government to make it appear that the banishment of the religious orders would make no great gap in the educational system of the country. For several years the struggle had been going on before the final wrench was effected. By going back to the Commissioner's Report for the year 1902 we find some information which enables us to get an inkling of the intensity of that struggle. For instance, it is shown by tabular comparisons that the decline in public school enrollment became somewhat marked after 1889-90, or toward the end of the period assigned for the full secularization of the schools for boys. A transfer of pupils had been going on since that date from public and secular to private schools belonging to the religious orders.

Evidently the religious teaching had been pushing the secular hard, judging from the following table of enrollment in the respective classes of schools:

SECULAR.

	1891-92.	1896-97.
Public:		
Boys	2,318,349	2,292,639
Girls	1,434,901	1,487,766
Private:		
Boys	53,955	48,199
Girls	97,722	83,202

CLERICAL (UNDER RELIGIOUS ORDERS).

Public:		
Boys	36,969	25,766
Girls	490,964	384,149
Private:		
Boys	396,576	415,943
Girls	730,984	793,754

The proportions of religious teachers to lay were set forth in another table, which showed that in the public schools there were men belonging to religious orders teaching in the public schools, for the period 1886-87, to the number of 3,544, and in private schools, for the same period, a total of 6,560; while of women belonging to religious orders there were simultaneously teaching a total of 13,265. In the next quinquennial period the men of the religious orders teaching in the public schools had dropped down to the number of 132, while in private schools they showed a total of 9,249 for the same period, as compared with 6,540 for the preceding five year term; and in the next one they had increased in the private schools to 968, while they had disappeared altogether from the public ones. The women belonging to religious orders who taught fell away by over 2,000 in the public schools during the same period, while they increased from a little over 24,000 in 1886-87 to over 30,000 in 1896-97 in the private schools.

These religious teachers have now been all swept out of the primary schools as well as out of the secondary ones. In the latter there was more than 50 per cent. of the total secondary school population. The total number given in the year before the separation was 62,000. Now, the question which the Commissioner's Report raises is, What has become of those thousands of scholars? Only about 20,000 are accounted for, as having been shifted from the religious schools to the public ones and to private secular institutions. Many of the former scholars have followed their teachers across the frontier into Belgium. In the opinion of M. Steeg, a member of the Chamber of Deputies, many of the former students in the secondary religious schools, on withdrawing from these institutions, have taken up their abode in boarding establishments—of a semi-religious character, in Paris and several other large cities. Still, taking all these explanations into account, no satisfactory answer is forthcoming as to what has become of the enormous number of young men who had been forced out of both primary and secondary religious schools by the law of separation. At least 30,000 of these are still unaccounted for. The loss is not alone in scholars; the money loss to the Church has been enormous. The Commissioner's Report, on this subject, says: "Although the clerical

schools derived no direct support from the government, they profited indirectly by the annual appropriations from the public treasury for Church purposes. The loss in this respect is naturally enormous, as is shown by the fact that whereas appropriations for public worship amounted in 1905 to 42,324,933 francs ($8,464,986), they were reduced for the year ending April 1, 1907, to 543,130 francs ($108,026). The clerical schools also had the use of properties belonging to the Church, the final disposition of which property is still an unsettled matter.

Here are nearly eight millions of francs swept away from the Church at one stroke! Whence is this huge sum to be recouped? How can the sorely-tried Church contrive to carry on the work which this money represented? These are questions so grave as to fill the mind with dismay when contemplating the future of the Church in France; and, moreover, when we remember that this loss is not for a single year, but is to be repeated year after year, unless in God's providence the persecuting regime be overturned and some more rational rule be established, it is impossible not to feel the terrible gravity of the position in which this so-called "law of separation" has placed the venerable and immemorial Church in the once great Catholic country which led its hosts of deliverers to the Holy Land.

We have seen how the infidel government has failed in its attempt to form an effective corps of teachers, for the same reason that it will fail in making the child a sort of State automatim by eliminating the part of the parent in the matter of the child's education. Its theory is, seemingly, that everything belongs to the State, including the Church; the individual has no voice in the decisions of the State; he has to surrender his will to the will of the State, or rather to such persons as M. Briand and M. Combes, and make no demur. The action of the teachers shows, however, that great men like these are not always inerrant in their calculations. Teachers are men like themselves, and will not submit, in a Republic where they are told they enjoy unbounded liberty, to be snuffed out and treated as chattels or dumb driven cattle. Parents will likewise demand that if their children be not taught the principles of religion, they shall at least be protected from the language of blasphemy and insult to religion. This determination was manifested quite recently in a couple of remarkable incidents. In one case M. Girodet, the father of a child in a communal school in the Dijon district, had complained to the school authorities that the language of a teacher was grossly immoral and atheistic, and the charge was confirmed by the action of the local newspapers in suppressing it on the ground of its indecency. The teacher had ridiculed the idea of religion and declared that there is no God—"the only God was a well-filled purse," was

his declaration to a number of children. He also told them that the Germans had in the invasion of 1870 killed infants in their cradles, and declared that they were to be commended for such savagery because the French army is a band of ruffians. No notice of the father's protest having been vouchsafed, M. Girodet took legal proceedings claiming damages from the teacher, but the court refused redress, taking the extraordinary ground that the teacher's declarations amounted to nothing more serious than a matter of opinion! In a country like France, where patriotism stands on the plane of religion, so phlegmatic a view of a declaration almost amounting to treason is difficult of realization. However, M. Girodet persisted, and took the case from court to court, until he got the final appellate tribunal to declare his charges proved and to sentence the blasphemous teacher, not to dismissal or imprisonment, as he richly deserved, but to pay a fine of about forty dollars and costs.

A glaring contrast to the foregoing illustration was afforded by a case reported in the *Gazette de Creil,* an independent Republican journal. Both the cases, it should be mentioned, were translated for the *Catholic Times,* of London, and published in that able weekly. The French paper told how the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny at Senlis had opened a private school there, after their boarding school had been closed by the government, and had gathered a few pupils. This daring proceeding soon came to the ears of the government, who sent spies to Cluny to look after the bold Sisters. A short time afterward they were summoned before the Correctional Tribunal like common malefactors, and lined up along with such criminals in the courthouse. The *Gazette* sets forth the grounds of the indictment on which they were arraigned, in this order:

"(1) That they gave lessons in painting and advice as to manual labor to pupils of their former boarding school who applied to them; (2) that they organized an infants' school for children who were not of the school age; (3) that they established a labor bureau, the object of which was to provide work for young girls and women."

After a solemn deliberation on these high crimes and misdemeanors the terrible culprits were condemned by this remarkable tribunal, and were, we suppose, subjected to some form of punishment, although the *Gazette* omits to state what it was. We may safely assume, however, that it included the closing up of their dangerous school, as a measure of public safety.

While the wretched simulacrum of a government in France is waging this inglorious war on religion, and on women and children, the population continues to make war on the laws of nature and of God, in regard to marriage and the family. With deadly mathe-

matical certainty a progressive diminution in the birth rate is working out the equation how long a time remains between the present decade and that which will witness the disappearance of the French as a people from the face of the earth. The spectacle of Nero fiddling while Rome burnt could not be more horribly incongruous than that of the Clemenceau government playing the part of unmanly cowards in warring on priests and nuns and children, in its present rabid fury. Within thirty years the male birth rate has declined from 430,000 a year to 395,000. This loss will work out like the law of compound interest, but in the inverse way, so that in a few decades hence the pace down the hill will be like that of what is called "galloping consumption." There is a dreadful inexorability in the rule which God has established in the natural order for the punishment of violations of the moral law. It works as remorselessly as the piston of the oscillating engine, and woe to the nation that of its own volition invites the action of the dread Nemesis. Its days are surely numbered, and "the Mede is at its gate and the Persian on its throne"—unless it repent and cease to challenge the vengeance of heaven by its misdeeds against God and man.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE FIGHT FOR THE SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND AND SOME OF ITS LESSONS.

CATHOLICS everywhere, but especially in English-speaking countries, should feel interested in the great fight for the control of the primary schools which has been carried on in England for the past six years; and some of the lessons to be gathered from it deserve to be treasured.

The immediate origin of this stout struggle may be traced to the education act passed by the Conservative government in the year 1902. The purpose of that act was to increase the efficiency of all schools by giving them more liberal grants from the rates and to subject them more than hitherto to local public control, without, however, interfering with the denominational character of such schools, as had heretofore been designated "voluntary" as distinguished from "board" schools. The act of 1902 was considered a boon, but not an unmixed blessing by English Catholics. It provided larger financial support for their schools, which, since the act of 1870, had received considerable "grants in aid," but nothing like a due propor-

tion of public moneys compared with the "board" schools. But, on the other hand, the new act subjected the schools to a vast amount of local interference, which in many cases resulted in rather extravagant demands for improvements in buildings and equipments at the expense of the Catholic trustees. All the same, the relief to the financial burdens so long borne by Catholics in the maintenance of their schools was considerable. All the expense of the educational work of the schools was now to be defrayed, for Catholics as for others, out of the public funds.

The Irish members of Parliament voted for the bill of 1902 as amended by the Lords at the urgent request of the late Cardinal Vaughan, but against what many of them considered, and what events have since proved, their own better judgment. Thoughtful men among them foresaw that the illogical combination of public control and of religious tests for teachers would not hold in a country constituted as England is at the present day. The bill left the Nonconformists excluded from teaching in the numerous Church of England schools, and it placed their children in a position of inferiority in districts where there was only a Church school, wherein, it was said, the Nonconformist children were treated as "little heretics." One of the best equipped in educational matters among the Irish members—Mr. John Dillon—prophesied that the act of 1902 would one day be swept away and replaced either by an entirely secular and Godless system, or else by a Protestant compromise, in which Catholics would have no part. The latter is just what has taken place, or, rather, been attempted in the bill by agreement, a compromise between Anglicans and Nonconformists, which would have left Catholics in a large measure out in the cold, and which all but passed into law a few weeks ago.

The Nonconformists set on foot a bitter and well directed campaign against the act of 1902. They adopted the tactics of passive resistance to the payment of rates in districts where the schools continued under Anglican control. Well-known leaders among them, such as Rev. Dr. Clifford, allowed some of their personal property to be sold at public auction rather than pay the rates. The great Anglican establishment kept slumbering on and smiled at what it considered the childish waywardness of its Nonconformist brethren. But the latter meant business; they had nothing to lose and everything to gain. Nearly all the old board schools were already under their control; they had never spent any money themselves to erect or support distinctive schools of their own, and they now made a determined onslaught on the school citadels of the Anglican Church, so as to have a hand in the whole primary system of England. To add zest to their campaign, they raised the cry of

"Rome on the rates," claiming that Protestant money was being spent in teaching Roman doctrines, but ignoring quite conveniently the fact that the rates of Catholics were being spent in just as large proportion to support Protestant schools. But the outcry against Catholics was only intended to arouse the latent bigotry of the English masses; the real enemy aimed at was the Anglican Church and its vast school emoluments and patronage, from which the Nonconformists were practically excluded.

The active, well organized Nonconformist campaign had for result to swell the tidal wave of Liberalism which swept over England three years ago, and thereby engage the new government to make educational reform, agreeably to the views of Nonconformists, one of the chief features of their political programme. The new Prime Minister put at the head of the educational department a well-known litterateur and a strong Nonconformist, Mr. Birrell, one of the members for Bristol. Catholics had no reason to find fault with the new Minister personally. One of his own sons, as he afterwards declared in Parliament, was at the time attending a Catholic school. He showed himself kindly, courteous and considerate, and he was avowedly very anxious to save Catholics from harm in his proposed educational reform. However, when his bill appeared it was found that Catholics would not get complete separate treatment, and that the government's design to bring the greatest number possible of Anglican schools under Nonconformist influence would entail the disappearance of Catholic schools in many districts. Mr. Birrell's bill threw open the schools to complete public control, abolished religious tests for teachers and introduced into every ordinary school a colorless religious instruction somewhat in the lines of the non-dogmatic compromise hitherto in vogue under the name of Cowper-Temple teaching, so called after the two chief authors of it in connection with the act of 1870. The fresh proposal for undenominational religion was dubbed Birrelligion.

Stout opposition to the new education bill was quickly developed all over England outside Nonconformistdom. The Anglican Church awoke from its slumber and set in motion the machinery of its strong organization and its powerful influence. Catholics naturally and necessarily joined hands with Anglicans in resisting the undenominationalizing tendencies of the new bill; but the Archbishop of Westminster, in his speech at the Catholic Truth Society's meeting at Birmingham, in 1904, and at Bradford the year after, clearly stated that whilst Catholics made common cause with Anglicans at the present stage, they would part company if ever the day came (as, indeed, it has since come) when the Church of England would adopt its usual course of broad compromise in the matter of religious

teaching. Archbishop Bourne prepared wisely for the coming struggle by taking into his counsels the Irish Parliamentary party and making them the champions of the cause of Catholic education in England. How faithful they have proved to the sacred trust confided to them, and how well they have served it may be gathered from the words used by the Archbishop at Bristol last month at the close of three years' almost continuous struggle: "Our thanks are due in the first place to Mr. John Redmond and to all the members of the Irish Nationalist party, whose position has been one of extreme delicacy, for they had recently received a special consideration from the government and were looking justly for special consideration later on for some of their national aspirations. They have acted in union with the Bishops, and their action has been marked by courage, eloquence and remarkable Parliamentary tact." This generous meed of praise has been, indeed, richly deserved by the Irish Parliamentary party. Their position as advocates of the English Catholic school cause has been all along "one of extreme delicacy." After long years of very harsh treatment at the hands of a Conservative government, they found themselves at the opening of the present Parliament in presence of a strong Liberal government, pledged to redress as far as it could the admitted wrongs of Ireland. Yet at the very outset they found themselves obliged to sacrifice national for Catholic interests, and for the sake of the Catholic little ones of England oppose the pet educational measures of their Liberal friends and ally themselves for the nonce with their hereditary foes, the English Tories, Catholic as well as Protestant. It looked for a time as if the old evil destiny of Ireland were come back again to dash from her parched lips the cup of salvation. But, thank God, it has not proved to be so, owing to the "courage, eloquence and tact," as the Archbishop so fitly says, of the Irish members. Their position in Parliament was never stronger than it is to-day, and they have secured from the very Minister whose English educational ambition they had thwarted the very best university education bill which a British Government could be expected to give to Ireland.

But the situation was a very delicate one, especially in the early days of the new Parliament. The present writer happened to be present at its opening as well as at the principal debates on Mr. Birrell's education bill. Few scenes could be more impressive than that of the opening night, when a full house hung sympathetically on the lips of the Irish leader as he exposed in eloquent yet moderate terms the distressful state of Ireland, the causes that had brought it about and the radical remedies that were needed. A like sympathy was shown, some weeks afterwards, when the Irish spokesmen for the English Catholic schools showed that, whilst they had no concern

with the fight between the Nonconformists and the Church of England, they did find themselves reluctantly forced to oppose the proposed measure unless they received guarantees that the Catholic schools would be left untouched. They showed that whilst the contemplated religious instruction might be all right for Protestants, it was rank heresy in the eyes of Catholics, and they would have none of it. They set forth in glowing terms the sacrifices which Catholics in England had made for their churches and schools. Tears came to many eyes as the leader of the Irish in England described the causes that had brought so many Irish poor to its shores, and the heroism with which the fugitives from famine built up schools for their children without any State aid in the very centres of British opulence.

It became clear, in the course of the debate in Parliament, that the majority recognized the special position and the special claims of Catholics, and the government strove to reduce to a minimum the hardships which the new bill would inflict on certain number of Catholic schools. But the Anglicans protested against separate treatment for Catholics, and it was found in the end impracticable to satisfy just Catholic claims without leaving the vast bulk of Church of England schools intact, and thereby dissatisfying the Nonconformists. Indeed, this has been the Scylla and Charybdis during the entire conflict, and has been the cause of the deadlock which still obtains. There was no denial then, nor has there been since, of the exceptional position and claims of Catholics, but the majority in Parliament refused to recognize any right in the Church of England to claim exceptional treatment in a national system. Brilliant speakers and writers, such as Mr. Herbert Paul, drove home the argument that the Anglican Church, having been established by English law, was subject in every particular to Parliament. But Anglicanism was backed by the House of Lords, and the Peers killed the Nonconformist educational offspring.

When Mr. Birrell retired from the Education Office to the no less difficult but, as events have proved, more fruitful field of the Irish Secretaryship, his successor in office, Mr. McKenna, tried his hand twice at educational bills, which met with much stiffer opposition and ended in a still more ignominious failure. Its author had soon to be relegated to another sphere of labor.

Finally the government, grown tired of its repeated failure to carry through its educational projects, confided to the new Minister of Education, Mr. Runciman, the task of arriving at some compromise between the Church of England and the Nonconformists. Accordingly negotiations were opened last summer with the Archbishop of Canterbury. His Grace naturally yielded to the overtures

made with a view to compromise. For he is the official ecclesiastical head of a Church which was founded on compromise and which boasts of the broadly comprehensive spirit which makes membership of it possible for the Low Churchman of little or no faith as well as for the High Churchman, whose beliefs and practices are almost identical with those of Catholics. Dr. Davidson agreed to a compromise whereby the Anglican Church would turn over its schools to the Board of Education, to be managed and taught like all other board schools. The Church of England was to receive in return what was called "the right of entry"—that is, the right to have religious teachers of its own enter every school twice a week and teach its tenets to the pupils whose parents did not object. Those same pupils were to be taught Cowper-Templeism three other days of the week. Moreover, such schools as did not wish to accept this arrangement would be free to contract out of the system, but they would receive a very diminished and unequal grant in aid from imperial funds. This "contracting out" clause was intended by the government chiefly for the benefit of Catholics, who it was well known would have nothing to do with compromise regarding religious instruction. And had the sum offered to contracting out schools been sufficient to meet their just requirements, Catholics would have raised no objection to the bill. But the sums proposed were found to be inadequate, and the acceptance of them would have entailed a loss to the Catholic body of about a million dollars a year, or, as it was put, a sum equal to the building of a new Westminster Cathedral each year. The object of the government in keeping down the amount to be given to contracting out schools was not so much to penalize Catholics as to force the High Church schools to come under the national system.

Here again was the old difficulty to do justice to Catholics without at the same time encouraging the High Anglicans to keep out of the national undenominational system. And it was on this rock that the bill was wrecked and abandoned. Catholics could not accept the financial terms offered, because they were inadequate to keep up the schools to the same standard of efficiency which was to be required of them as of the richly provided rate aided schools, and a far larger number of High Anglican schools than was expected wanted to contract out and insisted on better facilities for so doing. This was precisely what the government did not wish to countenance, and in face of the Anglican opposition, which was backed by a majority of the laity and clergy, though not of the Bishops, the bill by (supposed) agreement was abandoned. The *coup de grace* was given to it by the Representative Church Council held on December 3. At this meeting the Archbishop of Canterbury made a strong *apologia*

for his action in striving to arrive at a settlement which he thought would be on the whole favorable to the Church of England. He pointed out that within the past three years 550 Anglican schools had been closed, and that at this rate there would soon be very few Church schools left. The new bill gave them the liberty which they did not now possess to follow their children into the public elementary schools and instruct them there twice a week. The Bishops present, the official heads of the Church of England, were nearly all on the side of the Archbishop for compromise, but the vast majority of the representatives of the clergy and laity would have none of it. A strongly worded motion against it was presented by Sir Alfred Cripps and ably supported by the chief leaders of the High Church party. They showed that the proposed bill endowed forever the colorless religion known as Cowper-Templeism; that the right of entry for Anglicans would become in course of time a dead letter; that the consciences of large bodies of churchmen were aggrieved by the proposed compromise. The mover of this resolution scored severely the apathy of the prelates, which, he maintained, was the chief cause of the woful squeezing out of Church schools now taking place all over the country. This motion was finally voted on, with the result that the Bishops were 18 to 3 against it; the clergy were 73 to 35 for it, and so were the laity in the proportion of 113 to 46. And although the resolution was declared lost because it did not obtain the consent of the three houses, the discussion opened the eyes of the government to the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury did not represent an agreed or united Church of England in the negotiations. This discovery, together with the united and persistent opposition of Catholics, voiced by the Archbishop of Westminster and his colleagues and supported by the united "courage, eloquence and tact" of the Irish Parliamentary party, caused the government to abandon their fourth attempt to settle the question of control of the elementary schools of England. There the matter rests for the present—that is, in the condition in which the bill of 1902 placed it. But the end is not yet. It is certain that fresh legislation will be attempted by one or other of the great English parties in the near future. For this Catholics must keep themselves prepared, and the very best preparation for the struggles of the future will be the taking to heart the lessons of the past four years.

The first and most important of these lessons is the value of union and organization. The Nonconformists owed their initial success in campaign to the active, well organized onset they made on Anglican supremacy. But it was reserved for Catholics to display in the course of the long conflict an absolute unity of purpose, an uncompromising adherence to principle and an organized resistance to

injustice which arrested the uplifted arm of one of the strongest governments of modern times. The union of Catholics was, of course, organic. Catholic religious instruction given by Catholic teachers is a *sine qua non* for Catholic schools, so that in this respect there was no room for divergence of opinion among Catholics. But it was in the plan adopted to keep this unity of purpose well before the public and make it effective that the leaders in the educational campaign deserved most credit. Whilst Lancashire and the North took, as usual, the leading part in the getting up public demonstrations to proclaim and insist on Catholic rights, it fell to Archbishop Bourne to watch the more silent but far more important battle-ground within Parliament. He wisely saw that it was there the most practical work was to be done. We have already mentioned how His Grace took the Irish Parliamentary party into his counsel and made them the champions of the English Catholic cause. The result has proved the wisdom of this policy, and it affords a valuable lesson in the right and proper use of an intelligent body of laymen by ecclesiastical authorities. The late Mr. Gladstone used to say that if you trust a man you should trust him fully. The same applies to groups of men. Archbishop Bourne not only confided the Catholic cause to the Irish members, but he showed them marks of the fullest confidence. He gave them a free hand and left them the arbitrers of the best tactics to be adopted as occasion arose.

Another very important lesson to be gathered from the educational fight in England is the futility of compromise, especially on matters of principle, and the fatal weakness of those who have recourse to it. Cardinal Newman has told us in his "Apologia" that the results of the compromise which he made with the ecclesiastical authorities of Oxford in connection with Tract 90 led him to hate compromises ever afterwards. Compromises on matters of faith or of religious principle are fatal. Yet all heretical forms of religion are necessarily prone to compromising. For they possess no firm beliefs; they are never sure of their ground, and every wind or view shakes them. Such systems of religion, being founded on private judgment, must compromise with the world or disappear, and they know it. It was, therefore, nothing out of the way for the official head of the Anglican Church to enter on the road of compromise, even in the matter of the religious teaching of his Church's children. But there is in the Church of England a very considerable body of able men and sincere Christians, who belong to the soul, though not to the body of the Catholic Church. These men loudly protested against the idea of compromise in matters of religious principle. Their views have found expression in what is considered the ablest review of England, the *Saturday Review*, to which, by the way,

Catholics are much beholden for its noble advocacy of Pius X.'s French policy. That journal had three articles on the compromise bill, in each of which the illusion and sin of the proposed compromise was set forth, and the very eminent ecclesiastic who fathered it in the name of the Anglican Church was handled without gloves as unfaithful to his trust. In the third of these articles, entitled "The Fate of the Compromise," the following expressions occur: "Cash stuck where principle was swallowed. . . . The Archbishop wanted a little more, the government a little less. . . . The subject of their haggling and huxtering being the religious faith of the majority of the children of England, we do not find all this a very seemly business. Caviare as it might be to the Gallios who make up the Settlement Committee, we had much rather this contention were about some 'obstinate questionings of sense and outward things.' It would better become a high steward of the mysteries of God. . . . Confidence in the Bishops is more than shaken. . . . We can understand convinced opposition, but the middle course, to profess—we will not be offensive, we will say to have—strong principles and to strive strenuously only to minimize their force—this is a position a plain man cannot understand; it requires an Archbishop or at least a Bishop to do that." The writer draws attention to the fact that "the Roman Catholics everywhere were active and solid against it (the compromise bill)." (*Saturday Review*, 5 December, 1908.)

The acceptance of compromise by the official heads of the Anglican Church has set in strong relief the uncompromising attitude of the Catholic Church and the reasons on which it is grounded. Nothing could have put in more marked contrast the unity and unchangeableness of faith and the unstable quicksands, the shifting beliefs and opinions of heresy. The conflict has thus been, from the point of view of faith and principle, a distinct gain to the Catholic Church in England. There is no longer any logical position outside her fold for the large and very influential body of High Anglicans who are in revolt against the compromising spirit of their own Church leaders. The heroic stand made by Catholics, notwithstanding the paucity of their numbers and the slenderness of their resources, must open their eyes to the one way of truth and life. It certainly has opened the eyes of numbers of thinking men, and it is morally certain that we have heard the last of the bigoted cry, "Rome on the rates." Catholics have vindicated for themselves a position in the education question, the justice of which has had to be admitted and the force of which cannot be ignored.

A further lesson which stands out clear from amid all this war for the control of the elementary schools of England is that the vast

majority of the people of that country insist on having religion of some kind taught to their children. They will have none of the secular or Godless schools such as prevail in certain other countries. This is satisfactory as far as it goes, for, although the religious instruction known by the name of Cowper-Templeism is very meagre and uncertain, yet the principle of uniting secular and religious education is sound and supplies to Catholics one of their strongest arguments. It is certain that it would fare ill with Catholic schools in England if ever the day came when the public elementary schools would be conducted on secular lines. It is to be feared that in such conditions Catholic schools would have to shift for themselves. It is true that this is what Catholics are doing in Australia and in our own country. But the circumstances are very different in this sense—that, whereas, American and Australian Catholics can and do support their own school system, English Catholics are too few and too poor to do so. The result of secularism in England would be for the poorer Catholics either inferior education or loss of faith. It is to the credit of British statesmanship that it recognizes the exceptional position of Catholics, and it is hoped that some way will yet be found whereby Catholics and all others who desire positive denominational teaching for their children will be able to secure it within a national system. In other words, Pandenominationalism, as it is called, under public control bids fair to be the character of the English elementary education of the future.

These reflections on the origin, history and issue of the great school fight in England supply additional grounds for certain valuable conclusions for ourselves here in the United States. The first of these, to which the Catholic Church in America is long since wedded, is the necessity of religious training in the schools. We have seen that the overwhelming majority of English people of all shades of opinion are agreed on this point. This unanimity on the part of one of the most enlightened of modern nations gives increased force to the arguments of those who maintain that it is very injurious for the best interests of the United States to spend so much treasure on Godless education, which is so frequently diverted to ends that are subversive of the very life of the Republic. It has to be admitted, however, that the difficulties in the way of denominational education here are far greater than in England. There is a much larger proportion of our population indifferent or even hostile to religion of any kind. Moreover, the Jews, who are growing so numerous and influential, don't keep up separate schools here, as they do in England, nor do they appear to have sufficient specific belief left in them to care to do so. The hordes of the children of their poorer immigrants are receiving free education at

the expense of the State in far higher proportion than the children of other immigrants, who, being for the most part Catholics, support their own schools. Indeed, only Catholics and the relatively small bodies of Lutherans and Episcopalians give any proof that they have sufficient regard for the tenets of their religion to support at their own expense schools where they will be properly inculcated. Strong religious faith is thus heavily mulcted, and the standard of education is thereby lowered throughout the land. Will the United States awaken to the deplorable deficiencies of Godless education in the primary schools and discover a just and adequate remedy? There don't seem to be many grounds for an affirmative answer just yet. The first step to be taken would be a united demand for religious education of some kind in the public schools. This would pave the way to the recognition of religion as an integral part of education, and once this was settled in the public mind, there would be less difficulty in recognizing the claims of denominational schools in harmony with the beliefs of parents. However this may be in the future, Catholics have reason to thank God that they have the liberty and the means, even though through great sacrifice, to uphold their own distinctive schools and make them the equals in secular training with the pampered secular schools of the State, whilst they are at the same time the nurseries of Catholic faith and morality.

JOHN T. MURPHY, C. S. SP.

Cornwells, Pa.

NEWEST PHASES OF THE EASTERN QUESTION.

"ROUTE to Constantinople." Such was the inscription upon a triumphal arch on the road followed by Catherine II. of Russia when, at the head of an army of two hundred thousand, she invaded the Crimea. Russia has never since lost sight of the "Route to Constantinople," and we may be sure that with characteristic tenacity she will keep her eyes fixed upon it. Hence Russia may truly be said to have been the greatest factor in the "Eastern Question."

It was Joseph II. of Austria who, perhaps, best formulated the *Question.* In the spring of 1787 he visited Catherine in her camp on the Black Sea to conclude a secret alliance with her. She then proposed to him to partition the Ottoman dominions and to restore the Greek empire of Constantinople. "But what shall we do with Constantinople?" In this question, put by the Austrian to the

Russian, lies the essence of the Eastern question. Decide what is to be done with Constantinople and you have solved it. We know that Russia wants Constantinople, but for very good reasons of state the great powers, and notably England, do not wish her to have it. Since 1566 Russia and Turkey have been in conflict at least ten times, and the end is not yet. The Danubian principalities were the occasion of the last war, and they may at any time cause a conflagration again.

Strange had been the vicissitudes of these remarkable peoples. Roumania, now divided into Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania, in ancient times the home of the Getæ, among whom Ovid had languished in exile, became in the second century a Roman province, in which Trajan established his legions. Trajan's memory lives in the land to-day, while in tradition, language and race the stamp that Rome impressed upon it is still visible. Goths, Huns, Slavs and Bulgars succeeded or intermingled with each other, and when the waves of foreign invasion had rolled back we find the country occupied by Slavs on the plains, and the descendants of the Roman colonists in the mountains. In the thirteenth century the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia were established. Turkish power gradually increased within these districts, and by the seventeenth century Roumania had become a dependency of the Ottoman empire.

The earliest inhabitants of Bulgaria were Thracians and Illyrians, both of the Indo-Germanic family. The Roumunea are the Romanized descendants of the former, while the Albanians are all that is left of the latter. The country became a Roman province in 29 B. C., with the name of Moesia. By the fifth century of our era Slavs had scattered over the province, but in course of time the Bulgars, who have bequeathed their name to the country, became the ruling power. They were, however, swallowed up by the Slavic population, so that the present inhabitants of Bulgaria, taken collectively, may be regarded as Slavs. Bulgaria retained its independence until, about the tenth century, it became incorporated into the Byzantine empire. A second Bulgarian empire lasted from 1185 to 1398, when it fell under the dominion of the Turks.

Servia seems to have been originally settled by Slavs, but it does not come into the full light of history until about the twelfth century. Its independence lasted until the close of the fifteenth, when it was incorporated into the Ottoman empire.

Montenegro, originally a part of Illyria, belonged for some time to Servia until, about the middle of the fourteenth century, it became independent, a position it has practically occupied to the present.

Albania, the scene of the exploits of the great "Scanderbeg," is nominally subject to the Porte, but the wild mountain tribes are

practically independent. Bosnia and Herzegovina, like Macedonia, were until a recent date subject to Turkey.

The fact that these countries were inhabited by a kindred race with kindred languages could not fail at an early period to draw the attention of that rising Slavic State to the east of Europe, so near to them geographically as well as ethnologically. Russian interference in the Balkans dates back to the seventeenth century. Moldavia and Wallachia, oppressed by the Turks, naturally turned to Russia for protection, a boon for which Russia claimed some compensation in the form of an allegiance. An understanding was not reached until 1711, when an alliance was entered into, but in the end the Ottoman arms prevailed. However, there had been an entering wedge. Constantinople loomed up as a prize to be coveted, the dream of Pan-Slavism began, and the Eastern Question had assumed definite shape. Russian agents were hereafter to be active in the field. The peace of Kutchuk-Kainardji in 1774 gave Russia an intercessory power with Turkey in the affairs of Roumania, and made her a powerful factor in Wallachia and Moldavia, while her active interest in the other Danubian principalities went on apace.

The Treaty of Paris, after the Crimean war, came to modify the existing state of affairs and pave the way for future developments. The two principalities of Roumania became autonomous as far as their internal administration was concerned, although they remained subject to the suzerainty of the Porte. The Russian protectorate ceased, and they were placed under that of the contracting powers generally. Servia, too, remained subject to Constantinople, but under the united guarantee of the powers.

Affairs continued more or less in this condition, until the war of the Balkan Peninsula in 1877. The spark was struck by Bosnia and Herzegovina, which, in the summer of 1875, witnessed a rising of the Slavonian population against the Turks. A year later, Servia and Montenegro came to their aid and declared war against Turkey. The Servian troops were under command of the Russian general Tchernaief, who had volunteered his services. When Servia was about to get the worst of it, Russia intervened, demanding from the Turks a cessation of further hostilities against her. The result was an armistice of two months.

In the meantime, Bulgaria had been in the throes of a frightful agitation. The insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina had sent its echoes over that land, and the inhabitants, anticipating a general massacre of Christians, began to organize a revolt. It was not a success, and the terrible Bulgarian massacres followed. About fifteen thousand people were put to death in the district of Philippopolis alone, and fifty-eight villages and five monasteries were

destroyed. It was this massacre that had decided the declaration of war by Servia. In 1877 Russia entered into the conflict most successfully. After the fall of Plevna her armies crossed the Balkans, captured Adrianople and the dream of Catherine II. was about to become a reality. But at the moment of victory her further advance was blocked by the Treaty of San Stefano, signed on March 3, 1878. Now followed the Congress of Berlin, which reconstructed the Danubian principalities and added another phase to the Eastern Question.

In the recent complications Roumania had sided with Russia, and on May 14, 1877, she proclaimed herself independent. Russia was disappointed that the Balkan States, for whose sake she, ostensibly at least, had gone to war, did not, with the exception of Montenegro, proclaim themselves her vassals.

Roumania had thus taken the law into her own hands, although the powers did not recognize her independence until 1880. In 1881 both chambers voted to elevate the country to the rank of a kingdom, and the powers soon granted them recognition. Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, who had ruled as Prince since 1866, was crowned King at Bucharest. The husband of Carmen Sylva, who had been Princess Elizabeth of Wied, was very popular with his adopted country, and he managed to conciliate his powerful neighbors, Austria and Russia, relations with which had been strained for some time.

At the Congress of Berlin Bulgaria was divided into three portions —Bulgaria proper, which was constituted an autonomous principality, under the suzerainty of the Sultan, with a Christian government and a national militia; the province of Eastern Roumelia, under the direct authority of the Sultan, and Macedonia, with part of the Vilayet of Adrianople, which remained under Turkish administration.

Prince Alexander of Battenberg was elected first Prince of Bulgaria in 1879. During his reign, which lasted about six years, Eastern Roumelia was annexed and a successful war was waged against Servia. After his abdication, Bulgaria continued its autonomous existence, and chose another Prince in the person of Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, who ascended the throne as Ferdinand I.

The independence of Servia was also recognized by the powers, and in 1882 Prince Milan assumed, with their assent, the title of King.

The provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with the exception of the Sandjak of Novibazar, were to be occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary, and Montenegro was declared independent. The Danubian principalities were thus placed upon an entirely new footing.

Servia now became the principal theatre of the rivalry between Austria and Russia. The King inclined to Austria, while Queen Natalie and the people sided with Russia. The unpopularity of the King increased by his divorce from the Queen, and, finally, tired of his position, he abdicated in favor of his son Alexander, in 1889.

Since the beginning of the century two families had competed for supremacy in Servia. The one was descended from Kara George, the terrible old hero who toward the end of the eighteenth century had for a time delivered his country from the Turks. George Petrovich, surnamed Kara (the Black),[1] is perhaps the greatest figure in Servian history. He was foully murdered by his rival, Milosh Obrenovich, who, in 1815, had once more proclaimed the independence of Servia. Two years later Milosh became hereditary Prince, and he remained in this position until 1839, when a revolution put his son Michael on the throne. In 1842 Michael was himself driven out and Alexander, the son of old Kara George, was proclaimed Prince. He held the throne until 1858, when he was deposed and the family of the Obrenovich once more ascended it in the person of old Milosh, who in 1860, when he died, was again succeeded by his son Michael. Eight years later Michael was murdered in the garden of his Belgrade palace and his cousin, Milan, followed him on the throne, the same under whom Servia became a kingdom. It seems scarcely credible that this tragic history of rivalry between two families, with its concomitant revolution and bloodshed, should belong to the nineteenth century and not to some obscure period of the barbarous past; and yet the tragedy was not at an end.

Alexander, who had succeeded his father Milan, married in 1900 Madame Draga Maschin, a former lady-in-waiting to Queen Natalie. This marriage was most unpopular, and the influence of his wife over the King rendered it still more so. All this resulted in a military conspiracy, and on June 11, 1903, Alexander and Draga were brutally murdered in the palace of Belgrade. This assassination once more placed the Karageorgevich family on the throne in the person of King Peter, who, in course of time, was recognized by the powers.

We may now turn our attention to Turkey, for while the principalities and kingdoms on the north were passing through the various phases of revolution, war and diplomacy, undercurrents were at work which were destined to revolutionize the Ottoman empire, and which may settle the Eastern Question unless a reaction set in.

It would appear that from the earliest times despotism was the favorite form of government in the Orient, a consequence perhaps

[1] In Turkish.

in the unchangeable East of the patriarchal system. Yet the Koran does not seem to have especially favored it. Writing of Islam, Vambery says that "there is no other religion so democratic in character, nor has the sovereign power ever been circumscribed to the same extent as by the maxims of the teaching of Mohammed." Nor can it be said that the Koran is opposed to the pursuit of knowledge. In the Middle Ages the Saracen race flourished in the East and in Spain by its intellectual attainments, and before the great mediæval universities had arisen, Baghdad and Cordova were intellectual centres.

It may probably be affirmed with greater truth, that the want of progress in the Ottoman empire is to be attributed to the character of the Ottoman Turks, rather than to the teachings of the religion they profess. Still, there have not been wanting occasional efforts at reform among them, and there have been times of great prosperity. Under Suleiman the First education was promoted, and the fine arts as well as literature flourished. With the death of this Prince, the decline of the Ottoman empire began.

Late in the seventeenth century the Köprili, Grand Viziers under several Sultans, introduced a series of reforms which were not destined to last. However, towards the close of the century, contact with European civilization began to tell on the character of the Ottoman people, who gradually became more humane, while the printing press contributed its share toward the cultivation of more civilized principles. But the progress made was slow, and when, toward the end of the eighteenth century, Selim III. endeavored to inaugurate an era of reform and to learn what he could from the French monarchy, then tottering to its ruin, he forfeited his throne and his life. His nephew and successor, Mahmud II., who ascended the throne in 1808, was more successful. He annihilated at one blow the power of the janizaries and established the *nizami djedid,* or regular army. His greatest obstacle lay in the people, whose contempt for the giaours was so great that they could not be induced to accept Western civilization as a model, while they regarded the Koran as the source of all knowledge. One cannot help admiring Mahmud, who, convinced that European civilization was superior to the Asiatic of his own dominions, pursued a steady course, with little or no encouragement and in spite of obstacles innumerable. Yet, for various reasons, his life work seemed a failure, although the *effendi* class was more and more brought under the influence of Western civilization, owing no doubt to the impulse given by Selim III. and followed by Mahmud II. The latter's successor, Abdul-Mejid, preferred the seclusion and pleasures of the palace of Dolma Baghtché to the cares of state, which he left to others. Fortunately

there were then some remarkable statesmen in Turkey, such as Reshid Pasha, and others who owed their ability to the influence of the Western civilization which had been invading Constantinople. The reforms they succeeded in introducing were, however, more apparent than real, while the true Turkey beneath the surface remained intensely Oriental. One of the greatest evils that befell the country at this period was the facility with which it obtained large European loans, and the facility with which the money was squandered on luxuries, the jewels for the ladies of the harem alone having cost millions. This reckless expenditure of money, without any real advantage to the country, sank Turkey into an enormous debt, and naturally tended to place it at the mercy of its creditors. Abdul-Asiz, brother and successor of Abdul-Mejid, instead of remedying the evil, continued the expenditure on his useless buildings.

It was in the reign of Abdul-Mejid that society in Constantinople, by this time fully under European influence, began to dream of liberty and a constitution, while in foreign countries a revolutionary propaganda began. Under the present Sultan, Abdul-Hamid, government assumed the most personal, autocratic and absolutist form, while the country at large tottered to its ruin, the navy went to pieces and the army suffered. Corruption and peculation spread over the empire, and Turkey became a byword for the nations of the earth.

On the other hand, education has greatly increased, the beautiful Turkish language has improved and the literature of other European countries has greatly enriched it. In spite of the opposition of the government, the country has become more and more imbued with the civilization of the West. Vambery writes: "Nothing would be simpler than to force the Sultan to introduce reforms by a joint fiat from the powers."[2] What the powers have failed to accomplish the party of Young Turkey has finally effected.

The fact, however, that Abdul-Hamid was able to carry the ship of state with comparative safety through the long period of his reign, argues well for his personal ability, which, I think, even his worst enemies will concede. Although Turkey has groaned under his despotism, yet it owes him more than one benefit, if nothing else, then surely the decrease of the national debt. He found the country indebted to the extent of over £200,000,000, with an interest of nearly £17,000,000, and further, as a result of the Russian conflict, a war indemnity of £30,000,000 was laid upon Turkey. The national debt has been reduced to £80,000,000 and the war indemnity to

[2] "Turkey in the Nineteenth Century"—in "Historians' History of the World," Vol. XXIV., p. 436.

about £21,000,000. In his day 3,500 miles of railway have been built, and the army, even though its pay was in arrears, has been reorganized. The Sultan is said to be an indefatigable laborer, working night and day. As to the army, the opinion of one acquainted with it for a number of years is very favorable.[3]

The labors of the Sultan, which, as he said when addressing the multitude from the window of his palace last summer, had been for the good of the country, could not counterbalance the awful system of oppression that had been weighing upon it throughout his autocratic reign. The network of espionage that encircled the empire had been drawn closer in recent years, and no one could feel safe. The army chafed under it, everybody was watched, and the spies themselves were observed by other spies. Myriads of eyes seemed to scintillate from the palace, penetrating to the home of the most obscure official in the remotest corners of the Sultan's dominions.

Everything was done to defeat the movement of Young Turkey, and many of the patriots were exiled to other portions of the empire; but the very means employed defeated the plans of the autocrat of Yildiz, for the exiles carried with them their opinions, which they did not hesitate to spread broadcast, thus becoming the active agents of an ubiquitous propaganda and sowing the seeds of constitutional liberty. The people, Christians and Moslem alike, groaning under an intolerable yoke, proved a fertile soil, and the revolutionary spirit ripened rapidly.

For years the Young Turks had been working outside of Turkey, with centres in London, Paris and Geneva. Their great obstacle arose from differences, racial and religious, among the friends of liberty. It was quite natural that the Turks proper, and perhaps the Moslems generally, should abhor anything that might interfere with the integrity of the empire, while the Armenian, Greek and Slav population, on the other hand, should welcome such a change, which might restore to them their nationality. Hence the difference of views with which the leaders had to contend and the obstacles to be overcome.

The Young Turkey party abroad was made up principally of Mahomedan fugitives and Armenian exiles. Among the former were especially prominent Mahmud Damat, brother-in-law of the Sultan, and his son, Sabah-ed-din. The latter, nephew of the Sultan, was destined to become at the early age of thirty the leader in the movement. The friends of liberty did not, however, organize until a very recent date.

In 1902 a congress was held at Paris, under the presidency of

[3] "The Turkish Army of To-day," Captain C. B. Norman in *United Service Magazine*, September, 1908.

Sabah-ed-din, without succeeding in clearing away all the difficulties. Five years later, a second congress met with representatives of the Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, the Ottoman League of Private Initiative of Decentralization and Constitution, and the Israelite Committee of Egypt. Greater harmony resulted and racial differences were smoothed over. The party seemed ready for a bloody revolution, if it should be required, and an oath bound the members of the Ottoman society together.

The Committee of Union and Progress in Paris took the lead. It was made up of Arabs, Albanians, Bulgarians, Armenians and others. The impossible had at last come to pass, and Christians and Mahometans extended to each other the hand of fellowship. The women in Constantinople and other large cities aided the work, for Moslem women might not be searched by spies and ordinary police, and they thus became very useful as channels of communication and bearers of messages and despatches.

All but three or four of the leaders were ignorant of the precise object of the movement and the goal to which they were hastening. The Sultan was aware of the agitation, but he was in the dark as to the movements of the society and consequently unable to check its advance.

The constitution which Turkey now enjoys is nothing new in itself. It is merely a resurrected one, but with stronger guarantees and a greater stability. In 1876, shortly after his accession, Abdul-Hamid had granted to his people a constitution which had been drawn up by Midhat Pasha. It was, however, of short duration, for in 1878, after the Russian war, it was summarily suspended. The Young Turkey party opened its tomb and recalled it to life in the summer of last year. Six months were spent in preparation, and Macedonia was chosen as the first field of operations, as the disaffection among the Turkish troops was more widespread there than elsewhere. The Sultan had at last overreached himself, and that very system of espionage upon which he had so greatly relied drove the troops into rebellion. The Committee of Union and Progress had begun its work by gaining the good will of the troops, for the army alone could render its success possible. The one on whose side the army stood was sure to win.

Niazi Bey practically raised the standard of revolt. With 300 insurgent soldiers and a number of Moslem civilians he successfully took upon himself, with the acquiescence of the people, the administration of the country around Resna and Ochrida. In a short time the troops in Macedonia had taken the oath of allegiance to the committee. The only bloodshed was in the summary execution of

a very few officers who hesitated. The committee was now supreme in Macedonia.

The leaders were in telegraphic communication with the palace at Constantinople, and they demanded of the Sultan a constitutional government. It was even intimated to him that the army was ready to march on the capital if he refused. For a while he hesitated, but it did not take the astute monarch long to see that there was nothing left but to choose between deposition and surrender. For the moment at least he gave up his autocracy and kept his throne. The decision of the judicial authority of Islam that the case was not one in which Moslem could be pitted against Moslem decided the issue. The Sultan was powerless. When he was made aware that the Albanians were foremost in the movement and that he could not depend on the troops he yielded.

His first step was to dismiss his Albanian Grand Vizier, Ferid Pasha, and to appoint Said in his place. On July 24 the constitution was restored. The Sultan swore on the Koran to be faithful to it, and the Sheikh-ul-Islam bore public testimony to the intention of His Majesty to carry out his pledge. On July 31 Abdul Hamid made a declaration to the powers that he had sworn to abide by the constitution.

At this unexpected result and at the glorious tidings, a wave of joy swept over the empire, religious and race animosities were forgotten, the Sultan grew to be suddenly immensely popular, and England, as the great sympathizer with the aspirations of the people, was loudly cheered. From Constantinople a thrill went out all over the Ottoman empire, and from all the provinces, with the possible exception of Arabia, echoes of joy returned to the capital. As one instance of the universal jubilation that prevailed, Jerusalem may be cited. The spirit of brotherhood and peace filled that warlike city, the name of which seems to be a misnomer, as never before. The people assembled in the great square within the military barracks adjoining the tower of David. When the Governor had announced the constitution and the band played the national anthem, universal cheering rent the air. Sheikhs, priests and rabbis made speeches, fearlessly denouncing the old regime. Moslems, Christians, Jews, Samaritans and Armenians fraternized and formed in procession, preceded by banners with emblems of liberty, the Jews carrying their Torah.

The new Vizier, Kutchuk Said Pasha, did not last long. Though a man of liberal ideas, who at one time had even been in danger of his life, he did not prove quite acceptable to the reform party. It was remembered that, together with the Sultan, he had been responsible for the suppression of the constitution of 1876, and when,

after the promulgation of the new constitution, he set free, together with the political prisoners, a large number of ordinary criminals, a trick to create disorder was suspected. Other causes being added, he yielded to the popular clamor and resigned.

Kiamil Pasha succeeded him. The new Vizier was eighty-six years old, and he had been fifty-eight years in the service of his country. Like his predecessor, he had been in disgrace and in danger of his life. When the constitution was proclaimed the Sultan recalled him to office and placed him on the Council of Ministers. He is known as the "Grand Old Man" of Turkey.

One of the objects of the "committee," which practically ruled in Turkey, was to get rid of Ministers and public servants who under the old regime had had a bad record.

The constitution had been obtained through the indefatigable exertions of Young Turkey, but without the coöperation of the army it would have been impossible. If the Young Turks set the wheels of the car of liberty in motion, it must not be forgotten that the army, the bureaucracy and the Mollahs kept them going and finally forced the autocrat to surrender.

Will this constitution prove lasting? Edward Dicey, writing in the *Nineteenth Century,* seems to be skeptical and to take a pessimistic view. He sees breakers ahead in a possible reconciliation of the army with the Sultan. This is not the only danger, however. The sending out of office of so large a number of old functionaries and spies, who are thus deprived of their means of support, cannot fail to swell the ranks of the reactionaries. There is also danger of abuse. Liberty in a people not prepared for it may easily degenerate into license, for the masses do not understand what a constitution means, and the name has awakened the most unreasonable hopes and created extravagant dreams.

Thus the originators of the reform movement may find themselves ere long between two extremes—anarchy on the one hand and reaction on the other. All will depend on the stand taken by the army. Should the troops fall out with the leaders and declare for the Sultan a terrible crisis may be awakened.

Still it must be remembered that the present constitution, established by a bloodless revolution, appears to rest upon a more solid basis than formerly. The Sultan has given the most solemn pledge in the face of the world, with the highest sanction of his religion, and the constitution has met with general approbation throughout the empire and beyond its frontiers. Officers of the old regime have not hesitated to adopt and praise it and fear seems to have vanished. At a meeting held in New York, at which Mundji Bey, the Chargé d'Affaires in Washington presided, a letter expressing

sympathy with the movement of progress in Turkey was read from President Roosevelt. The Turk can hardly retrace his steps and his shadow no longer inspires fear.

Behind this movement of Young Turkey another power must be sought for. It will be found in the harem. The complete isolation of the Turkish woman cast for centuries a veil over the domestic life of the Turk, into which no foreign eye might penetrate. Nowhere was the mystery of Islam more complete. Still the Turkish woman was the mother of Turkey. The tender age was, as in other countries, though not to the same extent, subject to her influence, and from her the first impressions were received. But the Turkish woman, or the inmate of the harem of whatever race, is to-day no longer what she was a hundred or even fifty years ago. If for a long, long period she bore her indolent, captive life with resignation, while her husband and other male members of her family fought their battles and pursued their avocations in the great world beyond, to-day she has grown restless, and the yoke galls her. Her eyes have been opened, for European civilization has penetrated into the harem. Though she could not mingle with the male portion of humanity beyond the narrowest limits, though her windows remained barred and her face covered, she knew what the world was doing, and she awoke to a new life and began to feel her fetters. The sounds of the music of France, Germany and Italy penetrated through her latticed windows, and she learned to execute the great composers; the literature of Europe became familiar to her, not only in translations, but in the original, and though no man might speak to her save her husband or nearest relative, the company of ladies was not prohibited, and her isolated life thus came into touch with the West. She saw how different she was from her European sisters, and she began to understand that she was a slave. She who had tamely submitted to her lot now felt rebellious at the thought that she had scarcely a voice in that most important step of life, marriage. She began to feel her inferiority when she reflected on the cruel fate that forced her to marry a man she did not even know, and though polygamy in its strictest sense is no longer universal in Constantinople, still the knowledge of Western customs could not fail to arouse her instincts against it where it did exist.

A resident of Constantinople whose position in society brought her into contact with the higher and most educated classes wrote me more than a year before the constitution was proclaimed: "I am sure you would find great changes in the last few years. There is no doubt that the Western world has had its influence, good or bad, it is at present difficult to say, but there is surely a revolt among the upper classes, who are educated by Europeans. I have been

told by several Turkish ladies that Loti's 'Les Désanchanteés' is a very true story, but the men out here say, naturally, that it is very false. I am inclined to believe the woman's side, from all I have seen, and I know quite a few most charming, highly educated, quite up-to-date Turkish women. There is a great charm about them. They are so gentle, kind, extremely dainty."

I may add that Pierre Loti seems to vouch for the accuracy of the picture he draws, though he has employed fictitious characters to bring it into relief. He has shown us only the harem of the higher classes, the one, however, in which this social revolution is taking place, and he has given us its most refined features, so that it really furnishes an incomplete picture.

Now that the emancipation of Turkey is complete, the doors of the harem will ere long be thrown open by the men themselves, who have borrowed from Western ideas, and the world will know more of such women, as Leila Sultan, daughter of Ab-dul-Hamid, a distinguished musician, and "Adalet," whose contributions to the *Nineteenth Century* lifted a corner of the veil.[4]

Of course this sudden awakening will not be without its evils, for license is often mistaken for liberty, but let us hope that this will be only a passing phase. Many years ago Fuad Pasha said that the emancipation of Turkey must begin by the emancipation of Turkish women, and Richard Davey, who cites the Pasha in the *Fortnightly Review* (1895), adds that "the question of the East is the question of women."[5]

The awakening of the unknown, mysterious world beyond the threshold of the harem could not mean anything but the awakening of the educated classes, and it is thus quite natural that we should look in the domestic circle for one of the causes of the revolution the world has just witnessed.

According to a London correspondent, many women appeared in the revolutionary processions in Macedonia, several of them unveiled and carrying banners. This act was greeted with applause by the spectators, who seemed to lay aside the deeply rooted Mahometan prejudice in this regard, while many men went so far as to kiss their hands, saluting them as liberators of their country.[6]

It is, indeed, most significant that a similar movement toward freedom exists among the women of Persia, having had, no doubt, much to do with the revolutionary movements in that country. Persian women are even more secluded than those of the Turks, nor can their education be compared with that of Turkey in Europe,

[4] "A Voice From the Harem" and "Life in a Harem," *Nineteenth Century*, 1890. The writer, a Turkish lady, was herself the inmate of a harem.

[5] "Present Condition of Mohammedan Women in Turkey."

[6] *Review of Reviews*, September, 1908.

yet in both capitals of the two great divisions of Islam, in Stamboul and in Teheran, the women are awakening to a new existence, after the lethargy of ages, and a social as well as political revolution is in progress.

I have reason to believe that this social revolution among both sexes has no little agnosticism as a concomitant. While the religion of the Prophet, undoubtedly, still has a strong hold on the masses, I do not think that it can be denied that in spite of traditional respect for the Koran, many among the educated classes have drifted away from the beliefs it inculcates without receiving anything instead. It is said that Freemasonry has also had its share in this modernizing work, and the fact that many of the leaders are said to be members of French and English lodges would seem to add color to this assertion. Freemasonry is, assuredly, a power, the secret springs of which are beyond investigation, but which has surrounded the world as with a net, a power that, unobserved itself, sets many wheels in motion, and which is able to influence public opinion to an enormous extent. Besides, it stands to reason that a secret society offers many opportunities to the conspirator, who, of necessity, is obliged to work in the dark.

The constitution had hardly been proclaimed than serious troubles arose in the Balkan regions and on the island of Crete. Perhaps there were undercurrents running counter to the aspirations for liberty that were then uppermost in the best Turkish circles. It has been suspected that the liberal regime in Constantinople did not meet with the approval of all the powers, and that a great secret conspiracy was formed and directed from various European capitals to discredit the administration of the Young Turks. The troubles that arose in the Danubian provinces would then have been the result of this secret movement.

Whatever there may be of truth at the bottom of this, the fact is that the trouble commenced in September with the strike on the Oriental Railway, in which the Turkish Government has a proprietary right. This railroad is part of the trunk line from Vienna to Constantinople. It runs from Turkey across Eastern Roumelia into Bulgaria. Under the plea of preventing violence, Bulgarian troops were ordered to "provisionally" occupy that part of the line running through their country. The strike was suppressed, but the troops continued to occupy the railroad. The Turkish Chargé d'Affaires at Sofia, the Bulgarian capital, protested to Prince Ferdinand's government against this protracted control of the line, which he regarded not only as a violation of Bulgaria's agreement with the railway company, but also as an infringement of the rights of Turkey as defined in the Treaty of Berlin. A protest was also

entered at the various embassies at Constantinople. This action of Bulgaria was far from meeting with universal approbation. However, heedless of public opinion and of citicism, the Bulgarian Government replied that "although the situation requires that it shall keep the Oriental Railway at present in its own hands, it has no intention whatever of infringing the rights of owenrship or of injuring the material rights of any one." It also made the declaration that it would deal directly with the railway company and not with the Turkish Government.

An incident had about this time occurred which may have influenced this action of Bulgaria. When invitations were sent out to a diplomatic dinner at Constantinople it was found that the name of the Bulgarian agent, Dr. J. S. Gueshov, had been omitted. To the protest of Bulgaria the Turkish Foreign Minister, Tewfik Pasha, replied that the Porte intended no offense, but that Bulgaria, being a vassal State of Turkey, its agent at Constantinople could not be regarded as a real diplomatic representative who could properly be present at the function in question. But Bulgaria was soon to shake off even the semblance of the yoke which the Congress of Berlin had laid upon her, and by her own deliberate act cease to be a vassal State. Before this took place, however, another event of deep significance occurred which would seem to strengthen the conspiracy theory and point to a concerted action in certain quarters.

On October 3 Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria-Hungary, announced to the powers through his Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Baron von Aerenthal, that his government would annex Bosnia and Herzegovina. Two days later Ferdinand of Bulgaria solemnly announced at Tirnova, the ancient capital of the country, complete independence from Turkish suzerainty and proclaimed himself "Czar of all the Bulgars."

This had hardly occurred than Crete was heard from. The Hellenic inhabitants of the island, nine-tenths of the entire population, profiting by Turkey's disturbed condition, hastened to repudiate Ottoman suzerainty and proclaimed themselves united to Greece. On October 14 this act was confirmed by a vote in the National Assembly. Since 1898 Crete has been an autonomous State, nominally subject to Turkey, but really governed by a High Commissioner of the powers. For the last two years the King of Greece has nominated the Commissioner, and his choice was ratified by the four protecting powers—Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy.

Within a couple of days after this last event, Servia was wrought up to war fever over the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro declared her intention of joining Servia in the event of a war with Austria. For a while a dark war cloud hung over the

East, but in the end wiser councils prevailed, for Servia, isolated as she was from supplies, would have been at the mercy of Austria, especially if the latter had been backed by Germany, and it is very doubtful if Russia would or could have rendered any assistance. Had war actually broken out, the result might have been terrific, and several of the great powers might have been drawn into the vortex.

As it is, Austria had her way, and the two provinces were annexed without any formality except to haul down the Turkish flag and take the oath of allegiance from the army. Since 1878 the assimilation to Austria had gone on so steadily that the change was not felt.

In annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina, Austria pledged herself to give them a constitution, guaranteeing their civic rights and a representative assembly. This arbitrary act was the logical outcome of the Berlin treaty, which had really given the provinces to Austria, leaving nothing to Turkey but a shadow. Such is practically the statement of Baron von Aerenthal, who denies that the act of his country is a violation of the treaty, declaring it to be a development "which was foreseen when the convention was framed, and which in no way justifies the convocation of a European Congress."

This annexation would seem to be a German move on the political chessboard against Pan-Slavism in the direction of the Orient. For the last thirty years Bosnia and Herzegovina have been regarded as the "German gates to the Orient." We must, however, bear in mind that Austria herself, if freed from German influence, may become an instrument for the promotion of the Pan-Slavonic movement. Of her population of 45,000,000 more than 22,000,000 are Slavs, while the remainder—German, Magyar and Latin—are divided and hostile to each other. By absorbing all the Balkan States she, instead of Russia, would come to be regarded as the protectress of the Slavonic peoples.

In face of these events Turkey could, of course, not be expected to remain silent. The government at Constantinople, through the Grand Vizier, Kiamil Pasha, protested to the powers signatory to the Treaty of Berlin against the action of Austria and of Bulgaria. The Treaty of Berlin had, however, so often been ignored that there was little likelihood of the powers taking any practical stand. A protest was also made to the powers interested and to Greece, Austria and Bulgaria against the action of Crete.

In his speech from the throne at the opening of the first Parliament, which was inaugurated on December 17, and at which he presided, the Sultan denounced Bulgaria and Austria-Hungary for their "illegal and unfriendly acts."

Turkey may well congratulate itself on this auspicious beginning,

for the Sultan reiterated his satisfaction at the existence of the constitution and showed in every way his willingness to uphold it. It must also be remarked that the elections went off with dignity and without disturbance.

In the meantime discontent is, no doubt, brewing in Servia and there are other signs of unrest. For Bosnia and for its sister province, Herzegovina, according to a recent despatch from Constantinople to the press, an indemnity amounting to $10,800,000 has been offered by Austria and accepted by Turkey. It has also been stated that the difference with Bulgaria would also be settled on a cash basis. The Sobranje convened on October 28 as the fourteenth national Bulgarian Assembly, and as a result it was agreed to make compensation to Turkey, but the question as to the sum seems to remain unsettled, a question into which Russia has voluntarily entered.

There has been talk of a conference of the powers, to which Austria consented on condition that her right and title to the two annexed provinces be not called in question. Should the congress convene it is not at all unlikely that the *status quo* will be acknowledged and legalized. In fact, the acceptance by Turkey of the indemnity has settled the question between the two powers most directly concerned.

The difficulty between Austria and Servia, however, cannot be so easily adjusted. The question is which of the two States shall control the Serb-Croat population. Should it come to blows, it is quite evident that Austria is prepared to strike hard.

It seems, however, that there are many influences which will augment the movement for peace and avert the danger of war. Charles Austin Beard, Ph. D., in a recent pamphlet entitled "European Sobriety in the Presence of the Balkan Crisis," and published by the Association for International Conciliation, points to these influences and proclaims the present situation a triumph for the cause of peace. There can be no doubt that nations are becoming more and more averse to war, and that the movement in favor of universal peace is advancing. The bloodless revolution in Constantinople and the drifting away of the Balkan war cloud are signs of the times and, let us hope, harbingers of universal peace. Still we must remember that all danger is not past, and perhaps before this paper goes to press, new and startling events may have occurred.

Charles Warren Currier.

Washington, D. C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

"Turkey and the Constitution," by James L. Barton, Outlook, Sept. 19.

Angus Hamilton in Fortnightly Review, September.

"Kamil Pasha and the Succession in Turkey," Fortnightly Review, September.

"The Turkish Revolution," Edwin Pears, Contemporary Review, Sept.

Dr. E. J. Dillon, Foreign Affairs in Contemporary Review, September.

Alfred Rustem Bey de Bilinski, "The Turkish Revolution," in Nineteenth Century and After, September.

Edward Dicey, "A Novel Phase of the Eastern Question," Nineteenth Century and After, September.

"The Persian Revolution and the Women of Persia," La Revue, Paris, August.

"L'Europe et la Crise Balkanique," in Revue des Deux Mondes, December 15, 1908, by René Pinon, author of "L'Europe et l'Empire Ottoman."

"La Crisis Balkanica," in Nuestro Tiempo, Madrid, November.

"La Jeune Turquie et les Balkans," Le Correspondant, December.

The Albany Review, September.

"Secret Sorrows of the Sultan," in Current Literature, September.

"A Turkish Exile," Independent, September 17.

Nouvelle Revue, August 1.

Positivist Review, September.

Sozialistische Monatshefte, August.

Bibliothèque Universelle, August.

United Service Magaizine, September.

The World To-day, December.

The World Mirror, December.

"The Balkan Tangle," by Louis A. Springer, in Van Norden Magazine, December.

"L'Esercito nel Movimento Costituzionale della Turchia," Rivista d'Italia, October.

Rassegna Nazionale, November.

Catholic World, December.

Fortnightly Review, November.

Review of Reviews.

"The Crisis in the Near East," Nineteenth Century and After, November; also in the same number, "The Military Situation in the Balkans."

"World Politics," in North American Review, December.

"Bulgaria, a Nation Reborn," Putnam's Monthly, December.

"The Man Who May Make a New Empire," World's Work, December.

"Scenes From Life in Cairo," a story, Mary L. Whateley, 1883.

"The English Governess in Egypt," by Emmeline Lott, 1867.

"Nights in the Harem," the same.

"Thirty Years in the Harem, or, the Autobiography of Melek Hanum," Harper Brothers, 1872.

The "Historians' History of the World" gives a good bibliography of works on Turkey and on the Danubian Principalities. My citation of this work is by no means an unqualified endorsement of it. To a Catholic, and even to a Christian, I must say that, in spite of its erudition and many useful features, it contains matter that no orthodox Christian, not to say Catholic, can endorse.

A DREAMER OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

THERE are surely reasons not a few for making a study of *The Pilgrim's Progress from this world to that which is to come, delivered under the similitude of a dream, wherein is discovered the manner of his setting out, his dangerous journey and safe arrival at the desired country.* The book is interesting as a reflection of Bunyan's own world, with its manners, its ways and its talk. This is a part of the historical side with which we are not here concerned. It is the product, too, of a mind thoroughly saturate —inebriate, in its classic sense—with knowledge of Holy Scripture—a knowledge shown everywhere in the phrasing of the work, but still more so in the mystical beauty of the way in which that phrasing is used. The version of Holy Scripture which Bunyan uses is the Jacobean, or "authorized," with its incomparable English, founded, as we should always remember, if immediately on the versions of Wicklif and Coverdale, ultimately on those of Catholic earlier translators.

The book is of those that have the power that comes of having been written straight from the heart. "If thou wouldst have me weep, thou must first weep thyself." It was written without a conscious aim. The author tells us in his own quaint verse how he "had undertook" to make another book than this; how different we can only thankfully guess. Suddenly he fell into an allegory about the journey of the saints and their way to glory; so he turned from the treatise which he had intended to write, and those happy "twenty things" and those happy "twenty more" which he says he had in his crown came fast as sparks of fire, to be put by themselves lest they should prove endless and eat out the book that he was already about. Even then there was no thought of a possible public of readers.

> I only thought to make
> I knew not what: nor did I undertake
> Thereby to please my neighbor; no, not I.
> I did it mine own self to gratify.

Only his vacant times were thus spent, and nothing did he intend but to divert himself and keep himself, in thus doing, from worse thoughts.

> Thus I set pen to paper with delight.

I have dwelt at some length on this account of the genesis of the great book which I want to say something about for reasons which there is no need to give, they being so obvious. It is a book beloved of thousands of readers of many a generation. It is a book written in strong, clear, nervous English, a book that has become a classic,

because it has the qualities of a classic, a people's classic. It is indeed a poem in Sidney's sense of the word, a true creation, a thing truly indeed *made*.

It is a book true to what holds good with all of us—the seeking of heaven, the difficulties and dangers and all the hindrances that beset the spiritual life, the sweetnesses and comforts that come to those who set their faces to go to Jerusalem, the necessity of diligence, zeal, self-denial, self-surrender—that self-surrender which includes all other surrender—the realization of the love of the Lord of pilgrims and His perfect work, the beauty of fellowship, the loveliness of charity.

The form of allegory was for long a specially favorite one for the conveying of lessons of truth. It is not the highest form, as our Lord, who used it so much, showed when He said that the hour was coming in which He would no more speak to His disciples in proverbs (or parables), but would show them plainly of the Father. But it is a form that has been helpful and interesting and has the highest sanction in that of our Lord Himself. On the principle of likeness or similitude are founded the literary forms simile, metaphor, fable, parable, allegory; and it is the very same principle that bids us to recognize "the spiritual meaning of every sensuous fact and that bids us understand by the things that are made the invisible things of God from the creation of the world." (Romans i., 20.)

Much of the allegory in English literature has a tendency to be overlong and sometimes even more than tiresome. It is surely not so here, so strong is the human interest, the characterization, the vitality. Where Bunyan's allegory fails is, I think, in the longer doctrinal conversations. There sin is no longer the great burden on the back, but frankly sin. When the talk is of sin and grace, the allegory is dropped. So it is Dryden's "Hind and Panther," where the "fairest of the spotted kind" is instructed by the milk-white Hind in the mysteries of Catholic theology.

How delightful is Bunyan as a giver of names! What characterization in such appellatives as Obstinate, Pliable, Worldly Wiseman, Good-will, Mistrust and Timorous, Greatheart, Hopeful, Faithful. Can we not, as it were, actually see the embodiment of spiritual blindness, *Mrs. Bat's eyes?*

Very old is the comparison of life to a pilgrimage, a comparison that naturally transfers itself to the life spiritual. "Strangers and pilgrims" the Apostle calls us as he tells us that we seek a heavenly city. The pilgrimage to the shrines of the great holy ones had been done away before Bunyan's time; to him the thought of such would have meant nothing, but he knew the spiritual pilgrimage, and so far as we may we will try to go along with him.

The starting point of Bunyan's pilgrimage is conviction of sin, followed by conversion. We must remember that the sacramental system is ignored, though there are at least two or three passages which might bear a Catholic interpretation, an interpretation which we cannot fairly suppose intentional. These I will quote further on. "Election," "conversion," "the day of grace," "the coming to Christ" —these are what we find. Probably a pious Dissenter of the present day or an Evangelical Churchman of the type that is so rapidly disappearing might use these words as Bunyan used them; but what I specially wish to do in this present paper is to show the great importance in studying a book like this—studying it apart from its place in English history and English literature, of getting into sympathy with it as far as that may be. In considering it as a book dealing with the life spiritual let each of us say: "How far can I, a member of the rock-founded Church which no tempests from without can shake, no wrongnesses from within defile, go with my brother, the Baptist preacher, the prisoner for conscience' sake, the dreamer of the pilgrim going Zionward, go with him as a fellow-Christian, and, more, even learn of as a poet and a teacher?"

". . . As I slept I dreamed a dream. I dreamed, and behold I saw a man clothed with rags standing in a certain place with his face from his own house, a Book in his hand and a great burden upon his back. I looked, and saw him open the Book and read therein; and as he read he wept and trembled; and not being able longer to contain, he brake out with a lamentable cry, saying, 'What shall I do?' "

The man, Christian, tells of his distress to his wife and children, and tells them how they must all come to ruin unless some way of escape can be found. They are amazed, thinking that some frenzy distemper has got into his head; therefore, it drawing toward night, and they hoping that sleep might settle his brains, with all haste they got him to bed. But he spends his night in sighs and tears, and is worse and worse in the morning. After a little while they can bear with him no longer and use harsh and surly carriages to him, driving him to take refuge in his own chamber or in the solitude of the fields.

"Now I saw upon a time, when he was walking in the fields, that he was, as was his wont, reading in his Book and greatly distressed in his mind; and as he read he burst out, as he had done before, crying, 'What shall I do to be saved?'

"I saw also that he looked this way and that way, as if he would run; yet he stood still, because, as I perceived, he could not tell which way to go. I looked then, and saw a man named Evangelist coming to him, who asked, 'Wherefore dost thou cry?' "

Christian tells how he has found by his Book that he is condemned

to die and to be judged. For this he is unwilling as well as unable. Evangelist gives him a parchment roll, on which is written: "Flee from the wrath to come," and directs him to a wicket-gate, which Christian can only see if he keeps a certain shining light before him, which he "thinks he sees." When he knocks at the gate it is to be told him what he shall do.

We may compare the beginning of Christian's pilgrimage with the lovely parable of a pilgrim which the Augustinian, Walter Hylton, has given us, and take, as I think it is quite possible to take, Bunyan's "conversion" as the "re-forming to the image of Christ," of which Hylton has so much to say. So Hylton's pilgrim sets forth to go to the spiritual Jerusalem, the sight of God, who is Peace, under the guidance of the Humility that says, "I am nothing, I have nothing," and the Love that says, "I covet nothing but one thing, that is Jesus." And this is Bunyan's aim—the conversion, the turning away from vanities to serve the living God. It is interesting to note that though the pilgrim reads his book, that Book in which it was held that salvation lay, to be found for himself by every individual seeker, this is not enough. Thus Christian must have help, a living voice, a human guide, Evangelist. So also at the wicket-gate we have, "It shall be told thee what thou shalt do."

As Christian is supposed by his unconverted family to be laboring under some frenzy distemper, so Hylton's pilgrim is told by his spiritual foes that if he hold forth his desire to Jesus so fully, he shall fall into sickness or into fantasies or into frenzies.

How excellent is the characterization of Pliable, who, while Obstinate entirely refuses to go with Christian, whom he and Pliable had followed with the intention of forcing him to return to the City of Destruction, is so attracted by the thought of the wonderful inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and fadeless, that he joins the pilgrim and hears from his lips such descriptions of the fair things of the future that he thinks the hearing of these things enough to ravish one's heart, and would fain hurry on the burden-hindered Christian in a swifter pace to their attainment. Then, wallowing in the very miry Slough of Despond, wherein Christian, by reason of the burden on his back, begins to sink and knows not where he is, Pliable is offended, scandalized. "Is this the happiness you have told me all this while of? . . . May I get out again with my life, you shall possess the brave country alone for me!"

With a desperate struggle or two he gets out of the mire on that side of the slough that was nearest his own house. "So away he went, and Christian saw him no more."

Mr. Worldly Wiseman next strives to hinder the pilgrim on his way. Do we know nothing of him? Has he not been with us, and

may he not be, in some shape or other, even to the end? And what of the village named Morality, where the gentleman dwells whose name is Legality, who has skill to help men off with such burdens as Christian's? What of the attempts among non-Catholics to substitute the study of ethics for the code by which Christians go? Are not these things a parable, and may we not find in the "pretty young man" whom Legality has to his son an impersonation of the attempt to put the duty of a citizen before the duty of a Christian?

In Bunyan's mind the application was, of course, to the keeping of the law. Flashes of fire come from the terrible hill (Mount Sinai), under which Christian finds himself standing—the hill that seems ready to fall upon his head. "And now he began to be sorry that he had taken Mr. Worldly Wiseman's counsel. And with that he saw Evangelist coming to meet him, at the sight of whom also he began to blush for shame." The true teacher warns him, and yet assures him of pardon and again directs him to the wicket-gate. Here we may note the cry, conscious or unconscious, for an infallible teacher.

At the gate a grave person named Good-will opens to him, lets him in, and as he is entering gives him a pull. Then said Christian, "What means that?" The other told him: "A little distance from this gate there is erected a strong castle, of which Beelzebub is the captain. From thence both he and them that are with him shoot arrows at those that come up to this gate, if haply they may die before they can enter in." To Bunyan ill spirits are ill spirits all through, real foes with whom to contend, foes ever watchful, relentless in their enmity to the pilgrims and the pilgrims' Lord. Christian must henceforth walk in the narrow way and avoid all of the many crooked and wide ways that "butt down upon it." To the request for help to cast off his burden, Good-will replies: "Be content to bear it until thou comest to the place of deliverance."

And the place of deliverance he comes to by and by. The side-note—and the side-notes must by no means be neglected if one would make a study of the book—says: "There is no deliverance from the guilt and burden of sin but by the death and blood of Christ." Who can deny this? We differ only in our belief as to the method of applying these priceless things.

At the House of the Interpreter Christian is shown strange things, lovely and terrible. Here we have the leading of the pilgrim into a little room where sat two little children, each one in his chair. Passion seemed to be much discontented, but Patience was very quiet. And the reason of the discontent of Passion was that while the Governor of the children would have him stay awhile for his best things, he willed to have all now; but Patience was willing to

wait. And a bag of treasure was brought to Passion and poured down at his feet, and he took it and rejoiced and laughed Patience to scorn; and a little while all was lavished away, and to Passion nothing was left but rags. And Christian saw how Patience had indeed the best wisdom. How fine is the portrait of the man of a very stout countenance who arms himself to cut his way through the host of foes to gain entrance to the stately palace, beautiful to behold, where there were walking certain persons clothed all in gold. How fair is his welcome from those within. We can smile with Christian and say with him: "I think verily I know the meaning of this."

How awful is the picture of Despair, in the man in the iron cage in the very dark room. It is terrible to us Catholics in a larger and fuller sense than to any "not yet of this fold." For to us Hope is not merely a good thing, a sweet thing and a pleasant, a something in the spiritual world corresponding to that in the natural which is the "merry heart that goes far in a day," but a virtue, the second of the great theological virtues, the possession of which is not a mere desideratum, but the fulfilling of a commandment. Hence to us the negation of that virtue, which is despair, is a sin. "God hath denied me repentance," says the man in the iron cage. "His Word gives me no encouragement to believe; yea, Himself hath shut me up in this iron cage, nor can all the men in the world let me out." A ghastly statement, undenied and unsoftened by the Interpreter.

In the second part of the "Pilgrim's Progress," relating the journey of Christian's wife and children, there are passages telling of the Interpreter's House that are quite unforgettable. Such is the one which describes the room wherein was a man that could look no way but downwards, with a muck-rake in his hand. "There stood also One over his head, and a celestial crown in His hand, and proffered to give him that crown for his muck-rake; but the man did neither look up nor regard, but raked to himself the straws, the small sticks and dust of the floor." We need not to be told the interpretation of this, but we all need to pray in some form the prayer of Christiana, "Oh, deliver me from this muck-rake!"

When he leaves the Interpreter's house Christian goes up a highway fenced on either side with a wall, and that wall was called Salvation. With great difficulty he runs up this way, because of the great burden on his back. But the time of deliverance was come for him.

"He ran thus till he came at a place somewhat ascending, and upon that place stood a cross, and a little below, in the bottom, a sepulchre. So I saw in my dream that just as Christian came up with the cross

his burden loosed from off his shoulders and fell from off his back and began to tumble, and so continued to do till it came to the mouth of the sepulchre, where it fell in, and I saw it no more."

How beautiful is the description of Christian's joy, the joy of the loosing from the burden and weight of guilt. "Then was Christian glad and lightsome and said, with a merry heart, 'He hath given me rest by His sorrow and life by His death.' Then he stood still awhile to look and wonder, for it was very surprising to him that the sight of the cross should thus ease him of his burden. He looked therefore, and looked again, even till the springs that were in his head sent the waters down his cheeks."

To some of us, surely, such an experience as this has come. We remember the sort of transport that came to us after receiving the Sacrament of Penance on some special occasion. Better still for those souls to whom this transport comes often and often, as the gracious *absolvo te* falls on the ear. For them a radiance is over all that nothing else has ever brought, and through all that wonderful joy they, as it were, look and look again even till the springs that are in the head send the waters down the cheeks.

How wise is the answer of Christian to Formalist and Hypocrisy, who come tumbling over the wall, instead of entering by the gate, and plead that if they get into the way, it matters not how they have got in. "I walk by the rule of my Master," says the pilgrim; "you walk by the rude working of your fancies."

To the base of the Hill Difficulty he comes, a steep hill and high, right up which goes the narrow way. And this hill was hard to climb, and because of the steepness of it Christian had at last to clamber upon his hands and knees. "Now, about the midway to the top of the hill was a pleasant arbour, made by the Lord of the hill for the refreshing of weary travellers. Here Christian rests, but instead of using the pleasant arbour as a mere place of refreshing, he allows himself to fall asleep within its shelter, and has much loss of time to suffer thereby as well as increase of danger."

The House Beautiful probably represents the communion of saints militant. At any rate we may take it so to our profit. Here is the happy meal at which the pilgrim sits down with Prudence, Piety and Charity and the others of the great, dear family who entertain him. "Now the table was furnished with fat things and with wine that was well refined, and all their talk at the table was about the Lord of the hill; as, namely, about what He had done, and wherefore He did what He did, and why He had builded that house. And by what they said I perceived that He had been a great warrior, and had fought and slain 'him that had the power of death,' but not without great danger to Himself, which made me love Him the more, or, as

they said and as I believe, said Christian, He did it with the loss of much blood; but that which put glory of grace into all He did was that He did it out of pure love to His country. And, besides, there were some of them of the household that said they had seen and spoke with Him since He did die on the cross."

Late at night they betook themselves to rest. The pilgrim they laid in "a large upper chamber, whose window opened toward the sunrising; the name of the chamber was Peace."

There are wonderful things to be shown him before he leaves; great records of many valiant deeds done by the servants of the Lord of the hill; all manner of things in the armory, "enough to harness out as many men for the service of the Lord as there be stars in the heaven for multitude," and, besides, many excellent things with which Christian was much delighted.

On the morrow comes the sight of the Delectable Mountains, Immanuel's land, whence he is one day to attain to the sight of the Celestial City. Forth he goes, armed by their hands with armor of proof—that armor which St. Paul had long ages past told us of: "Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off." Do we not see, "if the day be clear," see, with our spiritual eyes, the far-off heights of glory and beauty, to which one day we may attain—heights whence the very City herself, the holy Jerusalem, may be seen?

After the happy sojourn at the House Beautiful comes the sharp combat in the Valley of Humiliation. Not a few of us would be ready to bear witness to the truth of this experience, well knowing how often it is that hours of rest joyful, and even more than joyful, are sometimes followed by the sharpest trials and the sorest temptations, in the times when, with Christian, we are indeed "hard put to it." The darknesses of the Valley of the Shadow of Death are around us, and the confusion comes wherein we do not know our own voices and are tempted to think those things which are suggestions of the Evil One proceed from our own hearts. But, true as this is, it is not all that Bunyan meant, as we see by what he says in the second part of his book. There the horror of Christian's combat with Apollyon and the desperate trouble of the Valley of the Shadow are attributed to "those slips that he got in his going down the hill"—"the fruit of his own doing." So we have here a deeper lesson yet, even the lesson that overlong tarrying where sweet rest has come, rest intended for the strengthening of our spiritual being, rest designed for the renewing of powers that have been sorely tried, is a grave danger on our way to the Celestial City. The procuring of this rest, instead of obeying the call to strenuous endeavor, is paid for by sore loss of comfort and hindrance in

progress, symbolized in Christian's case by the loss of his "roll ("the assurance of salvation") and the delay and danger that comes of the loss of time spent in going back to seek it; great loss indeed, and often terrible temptation, under which the soul risks being sorely worsted.

"The Valley of Humiliation is of itself as fruitful a place as any the crow flies over," say Bunyan later on. Perhaps by that time (six years after his first dream) he had learned a still deeper experience, so that he knew better of the use and the beauty of this Valley wherein the lilies grow. "Indeed it is a very fruitful soil and doth bring forth by handfuls. Some also have wished that the next way to their Father's house were here, that they might be troubled no more with either hills or mountains to go over." How true is this, and how wise the Dreamer's comment: "But the way is the way, and there is an end." "In this Valley our Lord formerly had His country house; He loved much to be here; He loved also to walk these meadows, for He found the air was pleasant. . . . This is a valley that nobody walks in but those that love a pilgrim's life. And though Christian had the hard hap to meet here with Apollyon, and to enter with him a brisk encounter, yet I must tell you that, in former times, men have met with angels here, have found pearls here, and have in this place found the words of life."

More are the lovely sayings which we find in this book concerning humility. May those who read here go for them to the book itself. They should read there, too, of Christian's meeting with Faithful and of the meeting of the pilgrims with "one Talkative," and the sight of Evangelist, who predicts to them what troubles they shall meet with in Vanity Fair and encourages them to steadfastness.

How vivid is the description of this great world-old Fair, with its merchandise of all kinds for the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life! "The way to the Celestial City lies just through this town where this lusty fair is kept, and he that will go to the City, and yet not go through this town, must needs 'go out of the world.' The Prince of Princes Himself, when here, went through this town to His own country, and that upon a fair day, too; yea, and as I think, it was Beelzebub, the chief lord of this fair, that invited Him to buy of his vanities; yea, would have made Him lord of the fair would He but have done him reverence as He went through the town." Here the pilgrims are assaulted, besmeared with dirt and put into the cage, that they may be made a spectacle to all the men of the fair. Beaten and loaded with chains, they are led up and down the fair, and at last tried by an evil Judge, Lord Hategood. Envy, Superstition and Pickthank bear witness against them, and the jury, among whom we find Blind-man, No-good,

Love-lust, Live-loose, Liar and Implacable, bring Faithful in guilty of death. The most cruel death they can invent is Faithful's portion, who straightway is carried up through the clouds with sound of trumpet, the nearest way to the Celestial Gate. Bunyan knows how the martyrs fare.

Christian escapes from his enemies, accompanied by one Hopeful ("being made so by the beholding of Christian and Faithful in their words and behaviour, in their sufferings at the Fair"). And, as Hopeful tells Christian, many more of the men of the Fair would take their time and follow after. By-ends of Fair-speech joins them, asserting himself a pilgrim to the Celestial City—By-ends, among whose kindred are my Lord Turn-about, my Lord Time-server, Mr. Facing-both-ways and Mr. Two-tongues, the worthy parson of such a parish. How delightfully By-ends explains how he got what he avers to be not his name, but a nickname. "The worst that ever I did to give them an occasion to give me this name was that I had always the luck to jump in my judgment with the present way of the times, whatever it was, and my chance was to get thereby." Indeed, Bunyan's humor is not a small part of the interest of his book, with its dry wisdom and keen putting of truth.

Again comes sweetness and consolation, pleasant waters running through a meadow, beautified with lilies and green all the year long, where they might in safety lie down and sleep and wake to gather of the fruit of the trees that grew there, good for healing and for health.

Through the following of a by-path instead of the straight road the pilgrims fall into the clutches of Giant Despair, of Doubting Castle, who finds them asleep in his grounds and treats them in merciless fashion, beating them with his grievous crab-tree cudgel after rating them as if they were dogs in the dark and stinking dungeon where he had thrust them. He counsels them to make away with themselves, as Spenser's Despair does also counsel the knight who has fallen into his power. Hopeful keeps up the heart of his brother, as from his name it is meet he should, and at last they escape through the use of the key in Christian's bosom, forgotten hitherto—the key called Promise, that will no doubt open any lock in Doubting Castle. So the pilgrims go upon their way, wiser and gladder, too.

What sympathy Bunyan feels for the tendency to want of hope! He himself had known the anguish of despair, the torment of doubt; and especially in the second part of his book he dwells much on the subject by his presentation of such characters as Mr. Fearing, the poor pilgrim who "stumbled at everything and had a Slough of Despond in his mind," and Mr. Despondency and Much-afraid, his daughter, who go on their darkened way in pain and fear till at

length the clouds roll back and the light of the Celestial City greets them. Yes, Bunyan had indeed gone through needless anguish resulting from passionate credence given to a theology which it would not be wrong to call, in some respects, even anti-Christian. But the tender sympathy that had come out of this experience belongs to the great and beautiful kingdom of holy Charity.

Then comes to the pilgrims the sweetness and solace of the tarrying with the Shepherds of the Delectable Mountains, who look lovingly upon them and welcome them. And in the morning they lead them forth to walk with them and show them sights of warning on the top of the hill called Error, at whose bottom lie several men all dashed to pieces by a fall that they had from the top. From Mount Caution, too, they see the blind as they stumble among the tombs; and, again, they are shown a door, which is the door of that by-way to hell, wherein enter hypocrites and traitors, blasphemers and liars. All these had had "a show of pilgrimage," and yet were miserably cast away. And the pilgrims say the one to the other: "We had need to cry to the Strong for strength."

By this time "the pilgrims had a desire to go forward. . . . Then said the Shepherds one to another, 'Let us here show to the Pilgrims the gates of the Celestial City, if they have skill to look through our perspective glass.' And the Shepherds took them to the top of the hill Clear, and there they essayed to look through the glass, but they could not look steadily, for their hands shook ("the fruits of servile fear," says the side-note). Yet they thought they saw something like the gate, and also something of the glory of the place." And they depart with a song on their lips. Forgetful of the warning of the Shepherds, they fall into the snare of the Flatterer, and suffer grievously thereby. For they have gone on the Enchanted Ground, and it is hard to escape thence. Of the many they meet in their way it would not be possible here to tell, and one can only feebly indicate the rich wisdom, clothed in strong garb, often, indeed, of homespun, which the reader of this great book will find.

Past the Enchanted Ground is the pleasant and safe Land of Beulah, where the sun shineth night and day. It lies beyond the Valley of the Shadow of Death, and from this place they could not so much as see Doubting Castle. The sun shines there night and day, and here is to be heard the continual singing of birds and the flowers are seen appearing on the earth and the voice of the turtle dove is heard in the land. Hence, too, the pilgrims have a more perfect view of the Celestial City, with its pearls and precious stones, and the streets thereof paved with gold. And great longing comes upon the pilgrims, and they are sick with desire of the City.

On and on they go, their long and weary journey drawing to its end. On and on, till they come to the great River of Death, to be crossed by all, for there is no other way to the City Celestial. Christian begins to sink, and the sorrows of death compass him about, and darkness and horror fall on him, so that he cannot see before him. He can neither remember nor orderly talk of any of those sweet refreshments that he met with in the way of his pilgrimage. And fears come upon him, and thoughts of what he has done amiss, and evil spirits scare him. Hopeful helps him with words of kindly cheer, and at the last the darkness is past and the enemy is as still as a stone. The angels meet the pilgrims, and the reward is theirs to enter into the joy of their Lord. The waiting for Death is treated very fully in the second part of the book.

With a temperament such as Bunyan had; with his intense power of believing, of seeing; with his feeling for the lovely, the holy, the dread, the true; with his fervid realization of the spiritual world around him, the alive, the unseen, the high angelhood in union with God, the devildom in enmity against Him and His; with his gift of clear and fearless utterance—with all these, what might it not have been to him to have come under the teaching of the Church? And what might we not have gained in priceless possessions had this been so?

I have said that there were certain passages in the book which might possibly bear a sacramental interpretation, though that interpretation is not what their author consciously intended. I am not alone in believing in the unbounded suggestiveness of the work of great "makers," and the mystic in Bunyan may have spoken where the theologian was dumb. The passages which I shall quote, lovely as they are, stand out lovelier a thousandfold if taken in a Catholic sense, and the words of the poet may be given a larger, richer meaning than he himself could have conceived of. Let us be, like Christiana, "of quick apprehension," and apprehend the deepest and fairest that we may.

"I saw now that they went on till they came at the river that was at this side of the Delectable Mountains—to the river where the fine trees grow on both sides, . . . where the meadows are green all the year long, and where they might lie down safely. By this river side, in the meadow, there were cotes and folds for sheep, a house built for the nourishing and bringing up of those lambs, the babes of those women that go on pilgrimage. Also there was here One that was intrusted with them, who could have compassion, and that could gather the lambs with His arm and carry them in His bosom. . . . Now, to the care of this Man Christiana admonished her four daughters to commit their little ones, that by these

waters they might be housed, harboured, and succoured, and nourished, and that none of them might be lacking in time to come. . . . So they were content to commit their little ones to Him."

So are the little ones of those women that go on pilgrimage committed by Holy Church to the arms of Him who will carry them, as they rise, new-born in His grace, from the cleansing and healing of the baptismal river.

Take, again, the medicine that Mr. Skill, the physician, gives to the lad who has eaten of the evil fruit of the Enemy. It is indeed "to the purpose" it is made *ex carne et sanguine Christi.* It is a medicine good against all the diseases that Pilgrims are incident to—a medicine good to prevent disease as well as to cure when one is sick. "Yea," says Mr. Skill, "I dare say it, and stand to it, that if a man will but use this physic as he should, it will make him live forever."

Surely the words of the seer are here. Can the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist be more clearly, more fittingly expressed?

Once more, when the Pilgrims, Christiana and her company, are waiting for the summons to pass over the River of Death, "the children of the town would go into the King's gardens and gather nosegays for the pilgrims and bring them to them with much affection. Here also grew camphire, with spikenard and saffron, calamus and cinnamon, with all its trees of frankincense, myrrh and aloes, with all chief spices. With these the Pilgrims' chambers were perfumed, while they stayed here, and with these their bodies were anointed to prepare them to go over the river when the time appointed was come."

Yes, in the time of waiting for the supreme call, are there not nosegays gathered by loving hands for the waiting ones? Is there not flower and fragrance of all sweet spices from the gardens of the King? And is there not "the rich juice of the olive" *wherewith their bodies shall be anointed to prepare them to go over the river?*

The sympathy of Catholics has ever been deep and large for their forefathers, persecuted and deprived of their birthright and the glorious things included therein. Must it not also go out to the children of those persecutors whose fathers tore from them the goodliest of all heritages? Must we not think with a great and kindly sorrow, a sorrow, too, that is to be borne by us in our pleading at the feet of our Lord, of those who, having grown up untaught of authority, have groped their way through wildernesses of text, unconnected by the true spiritual interpretation? For those who have steered their boats near perilous shores where pilot there was none to be seen, have wasted spiritual strength in needless combat, have missed loveliness and helps and comfortings and guildings,

whether coming with the stately steps austere of Discipline and Penance or in the gentleness of the Banqueting House of the Prince? And shall we not be glad also, in the faith that in the wilderness the All-gracious One, in mercy and love for their true intent, to their great desire for Himself and His love, has granted them at times to find the heavenly roses of beauty and fragrance; the droppings of the manna celestial; that, among the rocks and shoals, they have discerned a light afar off and heard the very tone of the Pilot's voice? Shall we not take thankfully and lovingly all the gold which, if mixed with dross, is yet true gold; yes, and often gold of the finest? Shall we learn from a heretic? Shall we be taught by a Baptist preacher? Surely yes, in so far as the true vision was vouchsafed to him; in so far as the lips of the Dreamer spoke the truth.

As Mr. Standfast says, "I have loved to hear my Lord spoken of, and wherever I have seen the print of His shoe in the earth, there I have coveted to set my foot, too."

In the book of this Dreamer we may hear our Lord spoken of; here, surely, is the print of His shoe to be seen.

E. Hickey.

London, England.

CHURCH AND STATE.

ST. AMBROSE AND THE CIVIL POWER.

THE year 374, which saw the election of St. Ambrose as Bishop of Milan, is a date of importance in the history of the relations of the Catholic Church with the newly Christianized Roman State. Up to this time the State in its dealings with the Church had had things very much its own way. In the East resistance to imperial encroachments in religious matters had generally been feeble, and a majority of the Eastern Bishops had encouraged rather than resisted the attempted subversion of the Constitution of the Church by heterodox Emperors. The issues which for more than half a century, from the conversion of Constantine to the accession of Theodosius, had so divided Eastern Christendom, had been in the West, during the latter part of the reign of Constantius, the occasion of only comparatively short-lived dissensions. Yet, at the same time, it is true that Constantius had been only too successful in bending to his will the great majority of the Western as well as of

the Eastern hierarchy. The fourth century had, indeed, produced, before the elevation to the episcopate of the Governor of Emilia, several worthy champions of spiritual liberty, but to St. Ambrose is due the honor of being the first Bishop who won a notable victory, destined to have far-reaching consequences, in the already acute contest between the spiritual and the civil authorities.

It was, therefore, a new era that began when the voice of a child called to the episcopal throne of Milan the imperial Governor of Liguria and Emilia, better known in after ages as the great Father of the Western Church, St. Ambrose. From the beginning of his episcopate Ambrose took a leading part in all questions of ecclesiastical interest, and always as an uncompromising champion of the orthodox faith. His influence in the councils of the young Emperor Gratian was of the highest, but it was only after the death of this unfortunate Prince that began the portion of his career with which we are now concerned.

The successful revolt of the Spanish General Maximus and the subsequent murder of his imperial friend and pupil, Gratian, were severe blows to the Bishop of Milan. Britain, Gaul and Spain were content to accept the rule of the usurper, and thus only Italy and Africa remained faithful to the young Valentinian II., half-brother and colleague of Gratian. A contest for supremacy was now inevitable between the representatives of rebellion and legitimacy, with the odds decidedly in favor of the former. For Maximus was an experienced soldier and ostentatiously orthodox in religion, a fact greatly to his advantage in the West; whereas, Valentinian II. was a mere boy, with the additional disadvantage of being identified with the unpopular faction of political Arians. Still his position was not altogether hopeless, as he had the moral support of the Eastern Emperor, Theodosius, who, however, for the moment was not in a position to render him more effective assistance. The Bishop of Milan, too, was a powerful ally, who, despite his uncompromising orthodoxy, threw the weight of his influence on the side of the brother of Gratian.

The first assistance rendered by the Bishop of Milan to Valentinian II. was to undertake an embassy in his behalf to the court of Maximus. The mission, it is true, failed to attain its object, though through no fault of Ambrose. But subsequently matters were adjusted between the two legitimate Emperors and the usurper by the recognition of Maximus as a colleague. The political situation being thus adjusted, the Arian party at the court of Milan began to be aggressive. In the matter of the restoration of the altar of victory, indeed, the young Emperor was at one with Ambrose, but this harmony between Church and State was not destined to con-

tinue. The election of St. Ambrose had proved a serious check to the Arians of Milan. The predecessor of the new Bishop, Auxentius, had been of their party, and they had possessed strength enough to prevent the election of a known orthodox candidate as his successor. Both parties agreed to the choice of Ambrose, who was only a catechumen, and each probably hoped the Bishop-elect might adopt its own tenets. As it happened, the views of Ambrose proved strictly orthodox, and thus at a stroke the cause of Arianism was lost in its Western stronghold.

For the orthodoxy of Ambrose, as the future was to prove, was not of the kind that compromised with or yielded before difficulties. From the moment of his consecration worship according to the Arian form ceased in the churches, so that not even a single basilica was left the Arian court in which to hold services in accordance with their religious tenets. The danger from the side of Maximus for the moment held the ruling spirit at court, the Empress Justina, in restraint, but after this was removed a demand was made on Ambrose that one of the basilicas of the city should be placed immediately at the disposition of the Emperor.

Thus again arose the important question as to whether property vested in the Church could be disposed of by the chief of the State according to his pleasure. Previous Christian Emperors had settled the matter by the right of might, but in Milan at this time the forces of Church and State were too evenly balanced to admit of so easy a solution. Realizing this fact, the Empress, on behalf of her co-religionists, was at first quite moderate in her demands; all she asked for was a small basilica, the Portian, which was not even within the confines of the city. But Ambrose, realizing that a great principle rather than an insignificant church was in question, refused to accede to the request of Justina. This decision, naturally enough, irritated the court and a second and peremptory demand was now made that the most important church of the city, the New Basilica, should at once be handed over to the imperial officers.

But the members of the Arian court were quickly made to realize how little power they possessed to enforce compliance with their wishes. The mere demand for the New Basilica so deeply agitated the Catholic Milanese that the scared counsellors of the Empress were compelled to advise the withdrawal of the imperial order and request Ambrose to calm the public. They then proposed a compromise; the Empress, they declared, would be satisfied with the basilica first asked for. But the Bishop would make no concession. The day following this refusal, Palm Sunday, while Ambrose was engaged in instructing the candidates for the Easter baptism, tidings were brought to the effect that imperial officials had seized and were

then engaged in placing the imperial insignia on the Portian basilica. Thus the pride of the vacillating court had at length overcome their fears, and the crisis had come. When the news of the seizure became known, the people burst into fury. An unfortunate Arian priest, whom they encountered in the streets, would have fared badly at their hands but for the intervention of Ambrose. The court, however, remained firm. Gothic soldiers took possession of the contested basilica; heavy fines were imposed on the wealthy merchants of the city, and many persons were even imprisoned. But these measures, so far from intimidating, only still more aroused public indignation. The situation was evidently becoming dangerous, and the court again sought an accommodation with Ambrose. But the Bishop remained firm. To the argument of the imperial representatives that the rights of the Emperor over property in general were practically unlimited, he interposed a categorical denial; "those things that are God's," he informed them, "are not subject to the imperial power," but as regarded his personal property, the Emperor was welcome to dispose of it as he saw fit.[1]

While the troops remained in possession of the Portian basilica, which was surrounded by a hostile multitude, a great concourse gathered in the New Basilica, fearing lest the imperialists, now that they had resolved on bold measures, would seize it also. Ambrose was called for, and after reading the lesson for the day from the pulpit, he addressed the assemblage on the extraordinary state of things of which they were eye-witnesses. He began his discourse by contrasting the patience of the Milanese Catholics with the heroic endurance of Job. He then paid his respects to Justina by significant allusions to Jezebel and Herodias, after which he explained the reasons for his attitude in the question at issue. His refusal to comply with the wish of the young Emperor, he affirmed, was on the ground that to do so would be a betrayal of the trust assumed by him with the episcopal office. "It is not lawful for me to surrender it (the basilica), nor advantageous for you, O Emperor, to receive it." A church is the house of God, and as such the laws that regulate other property do not apply to it. "Do not, O Emperor, lay on yourself the burden of such a thought as that you have any imperial power over those things that belong to God." And after recalling the principle of giving to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, he draws the inference pertinent to the case: "The palaces belong to the Emperor, the churches to the Bishop. Authority is committed to you over public, not over sacred edifices."

During the course of the services at which this discourse was delivered several Gothic soldiers were noticed among the congrega-

[1] St. Ambrose, Ep. 20.

tion. Previously the Bishop had instructed the people to refrain from association with the troops, because of their participation in the seizure of the Portian basilica. This decision greatly disturbed the soldiers, who on the one hand had to obey orders, and on the other were cut off from the religious celebrations of Holy Week and Easter. True, most of them were probably Arians, but this designation could have had little meaning in their ears. Their fathers had accepted the form of Christianity preached to their nation by the famous Ulphilas, and of course the nice distinctions that divided orthodoxy from heterodoxy were largely if not wholly lost on a rude, illiterate soldiery. Moreover, they knew the late Bishop of Milan, Auxentius, though holding their form of Christianity, had been recognized as Bishop by all parties till his death. As to the question in debate between the court and the Bishop, that was to them a matter of indifference, but the concrete fact that they were excommunicated affected them grievously. Some of their number, therefore, while off duty hovered round the New Basilica, and little by little, attracted by the solemn chanting of the liturgy, they approached the entrance and finally mingled with the congregation. Their appearance at first alarmed the women, but the soldiers reassured them, saying that they had no hostile intention, but, on the contrary, that they had come to take part in the services.

The news of the soldiers thus fraternizing with the people caused consternation at court, for it was now reasonably feared that the military could not be relied upon for the execution of extreme measures against the adherents of Ambrose. The Empress, indeed, held out till the following day, but meanwhile the soldiers looked on while mischievous street urchins amused themselves by tearing in pieces the imperial insignia on the Portian basilica. Further resistance might be dangerous, and as Ambrose paid no more attention to threats than to entreaties, the soldiers were ordered to withdraw, thus leaving the church in possession of the Bishop. The fines imposed on the merchants were also remitted, and the victory of Ambrose was celebrated by the entire city, including the military, with every exhibition of joy.

A significant occurrence at the close of this incident is of interest because of the contrast in the issue with a similar occurrence of the reign of Constantius, in which Pope Liberius and the court eunuch Eusebius had figured. The chief chamberlain of Valentinian II., in the style of his predecessor, demanded of Ambrose menacingly why he dared while he, the chamberlain, was alive to treat the young Emperor with contempt. Ambrose calmly answered: "God grant you to fulfill your threat, for then I shall suffer as Bishops do, while you will act as do eunuchs." But times were changed, and the day

had passed in the West when an Emperor and a eunuch could punish the bold assertion of the Church's rights as Constantius and Eusebius had punished Liberius.

The imperial court accepted defeat, as was to be expected, ungraciously. The Empress bided her time, however, before moving anew in the duel with the powerful Bishop of Milan. The second onset in the contest opened several months after the events described with a proclamation of tolerance in behalf of those who professed the Arian creed of Rimini, and this was followed by a mandate summoning Ambrose to a debate with the Bishop, named Auxentius, whom the Arians had secured as leader, in which the decision was to be in the hands of a committee of laymen, half chosen by each disputant, with the boy Emperor as President. This absurd proposal was received by Ambrose with scorn. In his reply to Valentinian II. he begins by recalling the policy in Church matters of the first Valentinian, which was that only "priests should judge concerning priests." Now, however, the ill-advised son of an Emperor who had consistently observed this principle, foolishly asks the Bishop of Milan to submit to the judgment of laymen, presided over by an unbaptized stripling, in a matter purely ecclesiastical. "When have you heard," asks the Bishop, "that laymen gave judgment concerning a Bishop in a matter of faith? If a Bishop is to be taught by a layman, what will follow? Let the layman argue and the Bishop listen; let the Bishop learn from the layman. But undoubtedly, whether we go through the series of the Holy Scriptures, or the times of old, who is there who can deny that in a matter of faith—in a matter of faith, I say—Bishops are wont to judge of Christian Emperors, not Emperors of Bishops."

Moreover, what is there to judge? He (Ambrose) is the legitimate Bishop of Milan, with a title no one may dispute. The entire Christian population of Milan chose him for his office, and they are content with his ministrations. If Auxentius wants recognition as a Bishop, let him seek it from his foreign adherents; in Milan nobody wants him. In any event, even if there were something on which to pass judgment, it is already prejudged; the imperial edict in favor of the council of Rimini is clear enough indication as to how the lay committee will decide. If Auxentius has anything to say for himself, let him say it before a synod of Bishops, the only legitimate judges in a question of faith.

This refusal to submit his cause to a lay tribunal was followed by an imperial order, which Ambrose disregarded, to leave Milan. Thus once more were his opponents foiled, for, too weak to expel him by force, they had hoped he would submit quietly to an order of exile. The people also entertained some fears lest he might yield,

but in a famous sermon preached at this time he reassured them as to his attitude; he would yield to force, but to force only.

Things remained in this state for some time longer, on one side passive resistance, and on the other the wish, but not the strength, to proceed to extreme measures. During the crisis Ambrose, constantly guarded by a large concourse of his people, who feared lest he might be seized treacherously, kept vigil day and night in the New Basilica. This state of siege continued for several days, but the time passed quickly in chanting the vigorous hymns composed for the occasion by the Bishop. The great event of this period, however, was the discovery of the bodies of the martyrs, Gervasius and Protasius, which enabled Ambrose to consecrate the New Basilica with the greatest solemnity. Numerous miracles signalized the transfer of the precious relics, and these, together with the general enthusiasm of the occasion, decided the struggle in favor of the Bishop. The following year (387) we find Ambrose, after reconciliation with the court, undertaking a second embassy to the court of Maximus at Trier, for the purpose of averting, if possible, the imminent danger that threatened Valentinian at the hands of the man who had already deprived his half-brother, Gratian, of throne and life.

From the point of view of her son's interest, the contest in which Justina and her Arian councillors had involved Valentinian II. with the Bishop of Milan was extremely impolitic. Arianism in the empire had received its death blow from the hand of Theodosius; the East since his accession to the throne had returned to orthodoxy, and the West had never, save for a moment, and then not formally, departed from the Nicene faith. Under these circumstances it was pure folly to involve the young Emperor in a struggle with the strongest defender of the faith that the Church had produced since the death of Athanasius. Maximus of Gaul was not slow to see the advantage to himself of Justina's attitude. The orthodoxy of the usurper was of the strictest order politically. He had won the favor of an influential part of the Gallic and Spanish episcopate by his persecution, even unto death, of the Priscillianist heretics, after which he was in a position to read Valentinian II. a severe lecture on the doings at Milan.

The reconciliation of Valentinian with Ambrose was doubtless strongly influenced by fear of this powerful mentor, and the embassy of Ambrose was undertaken for the purpose of trying to dissuade Maximus from invading Italy. But the second mission of the Bishop of Milan, like the first, to the court of Trier, was doomed to failure, for the very good reason that Maximus had already decided to dethrone his young colleague at the first oppor-

tunity. This had now arrived, and the following year (387) his army entered Italy. Valentinian at his approach fled to Aquileia and thence to Thessalonica to the protection of Theodosius, while Maximus marched to Rome without opposition.

Whatever sympathy the Eastern Emperor may have felt for the fugitive brother of his benefactor, Gratian, Theodosius was too good a general not to see the difficulties of the situation. Maximus was, indeed, an unwelcome colleague, but the western portion of the empire was now in his hands, and a contest with him for supremacy would be no mere holiday expedition. Nearly a year elapsed, therefore, before Theodosius declared war; then, having contracted a still closer alliance with Valentinian by his marriage with his sister Galla, he set out for Italy.

The forces of Maximus were first encountered and defeated at Siscia on the Save. A more stubborn contest at Pettau was also won by Theodosius, after which he crossed the Julian Alps, took Aquileia by storm and executed his fallen rival. A new division of the empire was then made, in which Valentinian II. received from his generous protector not only the territory of which formerly he was master, but in addition that which for five years had been governed by Maximus. Justina lived just long enough to witness her son's restoration; after her death the young Emperor embraced the orthodox faith, and during the short remaining portion of his life had no more staunch friend than the Bishop of Milan.

The victorious Theodosius remained nearly three years in the West after the fall of Maximus, and, as during this time he resided chiefly in Milan, his relations with St. Ambrose were intimate. Two such men as the great orthodox Emperor of the East and the greatest of contemporary Bishops could not well fail to entertain for one another a high degree of esteem. Such, indeed, was the fact, yet on two occasions circumstances again forced St. Ambrose into opposition to an Emperor in the conscientious discharge of the duties of his episcopal office. On the first of these occasions the question was in regard to a disturbance that took place in Callinicum, a city on the Euphrates. A Jewish synagogue of Callinicum had, according to the report received by the Emperor, been burned to the ground at the instigation of the Bishop. About the same time the report of a second disturbance, in the same locality, between some orthodox monks and the Gnostic sect of the Valentinians was brought to Theodosius; in this case the Valentinians had attempted to break up a procession of the monks, which so enraged the latter that they had destroyed the heretical meeting house.

On receipt of these reports from the Count of the East Theodosius acted promptly. The Bishop of Callinicum was commanded to

rebuild the synagogue at his own expense, and the monks were ordered to be punished in some manner not stated by St. Ambrose in his account of the matter.[2] The Bishop was absent from Milan when these decisions were given, but on hearing of them he at once wrote Theodosius a strong letter of protest. Taking up first the case of the destroyed synagogue, he pronounced the sentence entirely without justification. For, in the first place, he maintained, justice demanded that the statement of the defendants should have been obtained before inflicting so severe a penalty. But, assuming for argument sake that the Bishop of Callinicum had done what was said, that he had been "too timid in the judgment seat," the consequences of a Christian Emperor compelling a Christian Bishop to build a synagogue will be very serious. For if the Bishop complies with the imperial order, he will be guilty of apostasy; whereas, on the other hand, if he refuse and is punished, he will be a martyr. St. Ambrose seems to suppose that the destruction of the synagogue was due to fanaticism, in order that, as the incendiaries regarded the matter, "there might not be," in Callinicum, "a place where Christ was denied."[3] Ambrose makes no attempt to condone the crime of the Christians of Callinicum; he, indeed, evidently regards their action as blameworthy. But from his point of view the harm was now done, and it was impossible for a Christian to remedy it. To attempt to do so by erecting a new synagogue, "a home of unbelief, a house of impiety, a receptacle of folly, which God Himself has condemned," would be nothing short of apostasy. Moreover, what a triumph this will be for the Jews, who a few years before, under Julian, had burned with impunity two Christian churches at Damascus, one of which is still in ruins, while the other is being repaired at the cost of the Christians. At Gaza also, and Ascalon, and Berytus basilicas had been destroyed by Jews, and at Alexandria a church had been burned by Jews and pagans, yet the Christians, under the successors of Julian, Christian Emperors though they were, had neither sought nor obtained redress. But now, forsooth, a Christian Emperor orders Christians to compensate representatives of a race from whom they had suffered bitter persecution for the destruction of a miserable edifice in an insignificant village. If the Emperor desires to reimburse the Jews for their losses, why not be consistent and order compensation all round? At Rome very recently the house of the Prefect had been burned down, yet nobody had been punished. Recently also, at Constantinople, the Bishop's house had been burned under circumstances similar to those in which the Jewish synagogue had been destroyed, but at the inter-

[2] Epp. xl. and xli.
[3] Ep. xl., 18.

cession of the Emperor's son the guilty ones had escaped punishment. Why, then, after all these instances of arson with impunity, make an exception of Callinicum? Is it because it is a synagogue?[4]

Such is the general tenor of this important letter. St. Ambrose repeatedly insists on the triumph of the Jews if the Emperor's orders are carried out, and on the fact that the Christians in similar circumstances neither asked nor received compensation. Moreover, he maintains, the Christians cannot conscientiously contribute anything to the erection of a structure for a worship rejected of God. He even warns Theodosius of the fate of Maximus, whose misfortunes were popularly attributed to his having given orders for the re-erection of a synagogue burned in Rome. Nothing good can come of this, it was said. "That King (Maximus) has become a Jew," and the punishment of his apostasy came in the shape of a succession of defeats which ended in the loss of his throne and life. Finally, says Ambrose, the whole question amounts to this: "Who is to avenge the synagogue? Christ whom they slew, whom they denied?" In a word, St. Ambrose, voicing the Christian public opinion of the time, regarded the order of Theodosius as impious, as nothing short of persecution, since compliance with it on the part of the Christians would be equivalent to a public rejection of their faith.

After forwarding this letter to Theodosius St. Ambrose hastily returned to Milan and in a sermon preached in the presence of the Emperor again brought up the question of the order to re-erect the burned synagogue. Allusions in the sermon were so significant that after the services Theodosius waited on the Bishop to discuss the matter. The upshot was that the Emperor yielded and the incident closed with a remission of the punishment decreed both against the monks and the Bishop of Callinicum.

Of far greater moment than this question of compensation for property was the conflict between Theodosius and Ambrose relative to the massacre of Thessalonica. The impression made by this incident on contemporaries is reflected in the overdrawn accounts of the affair given by Sozomen and Theodoret, which represent the Bishop of Milan at the door of his cathedral prohibiting the Emperor from attendance at the liturgy until he would perform adequate penance for his grave offense against the moral code of Christianity.[5] The account of the matter given by St. Ambrose himself, though wanting in some details, is obviously more trustworthy, and the principle at stake is brought out as clearly, if more soberly, as by these historians.

A brief outline of the facts in this well-known episode will be

[4] Ep. xl., 13.

[5] Sozomen, H. E. Vii., 25; Theodoret, H. E. V., 17.

sufficient for our purpose. The Master of the Soldiery in Illyricum, Botheric, had caused the arrest and imprisonment of a popular charioteer who had committed a crime of a very heinous order. Some time afterwards races of unusual interest were to be held in Thessalonica, a circumstance which at first drew general attention and afterwards sympathy to the imprisoned charioteer. A demand for his release was met with a decided refusal, which aroused the fury of the mob and caused a riot, in which Botheric was slain. Knowing something of the violent temper of Theodosius, St. Ambrose at once interceded with him in behalf of the Thessalonians, and received a promise of clemency. But subsequently other councils prevailed, and without the knowledge of the Bishop an order was forwarded to Thessalonica which resulted in the indiscriminate massacre of seven or more thousand citizens.

It was only after the despatch of the fatal order that Theodosius came to realize what would be the possible consequence. He then endeavored, but too late, to countermand it. When the tidings of the massacre were brought to Milan St. Ambrose at once addressed the Emperor in a letter of dignified rebuke, calling his attention to the penalty which as a Christian, and notwithstanding his imperial dignity, he shall have to pay as satisfaction for his inexcusable violence. The Bishop begins with an allusion to the friendship that has long existed between himself and Theodosius, and expresses his high appreciation of the many favors of which he has been the recipient at the hands of the Emperor. Of late, Ambrose continues, he has kept away from court, not from any ungrateful feeling, but because he saw very clearly that other counsellors were preferred before him, and because in particular his advice on the Thessalonian question had been rejected. Beforehand he had plainly stated that a punishment of the citizens of Thessalonica such as had since been carried into effect would be an outrage of the most atrocious character. At the time Theodosius agreed with him, and promised leniency, yet he had subsequently, at the instance of courtiers, changed his mind, with the most fatal results. But now that the harm is done, only one thing is left—the Emperor must do penance for his sin, which penance must be commensurate with the offense. Until he has thus satisfied the requirements of the Church's laws he must not attend the celebration of the liturgy, for the Bishop will not dare offer sacrifice if he intends to be present. This letter Ambrose has written with his own hand, lest any one should be aware of its contents; it is for the eye of the Emperor alone.[6]

From the tenor of this communication it is clear that St. Ambrose privately warned Theodosius that he must consider himself excom-

[6] St. Ambrose, Ep. li., 14.

municated until such time as he shall be ready to acknowledge publicly, as any other Christian, and do penance for his offense. As to whether the Emperor, as Sozomen and Theodoret affirm, endeavored to force the issue by attempting to enter the basilica, despite this prohibition, may be doubted. Theodosius knew too well the sort of man with whom he had to deal to act in the manner described by these historians. It is now generally regarded as more in harmony with the probabilities to admit only that Theodosius, after some hesitation, accepted the Bishop's decision and gave the public satisfaction required of him.

The question of the massacre of Thessalonica was the last of importance that arose in the West in the fourth century as an issue between the directing authorities of Church and State. The great impression made on the minds of contemporary Christians by the firmness of St. Ambrose is well indicated by the dramatic accounts of the occurrence handed down by the Eastern historians, Sozomen and Theodoret. But while modern writers generally agree in discounting their recitals, yet the actual facts are indisputably of immense importance. For, if we stop to contrast the relations of Constantine to the churchmen of his time with those of the successive Emperors who ruled in Milan in the last quarter of the fourth century, one cannot fail to observe a striking change in the relations of the two powers in Western Christendom. From the moment of his conversion Constantine, though deferential in certain respects to the ecclesiastical authorities, assumed as a matter of course the position of a Christian *Pontifex Maximus*. The precedent thus established, without protest, was not merely followed literally, but developed in a sense which would ultimately, unless successfully resisted, prove ruinous to the legitimate freedom which the Church should exercise. The Eastern portion of the empire, from this point of view, had been particularly unfortunate. Emperor after Emperor, from Constantine to Valens, imposed on the Church with too great success his will as the supreme directing authority in Christendom. And although in theory the civil rulers generally admitted that they had no authority in the domain of faith; that their self-assumed duties were exercised in their character of "Bishops of the Exterior," yet in practice they constituted themselves the final judges of the orthodoxy of creeds to which Christian Bishops were compelled, under pain of exile, to subscribe.

The West had been more fortunate in being governed, save during part of the reign of Constantius, by Emperors who had little taste for matters theological. The Western Bishops, too, were at one when conflicts did arise as to the limits of imperial interference in ecclesiastical administration. And although they yielded on one

famous occasion—at the synod of Rimini—to the imperial will, yet they were themselves the first to deplore their fall and withdraw their adhesion to a doubtful formula. A large and most influential section of the Eastern episcopate, on the other hand, all through the fourth century, so far from protesting against, actually encouraged, in the interest of their own worldly ambitions, the assumption of supreme authority by the Emperors within the Church. Successive heresiarchs in the East were the originators and fomenters of Cæsaropapism. And even at the close of the century, when the orthodox, in the reign of Theodosius, came into favor, they also were disposed to permit without protest this Emperor to exercise prerogatives to which the Divine Constitution of the Church gave him not the shadow of a claim. It was only when Theodosius visited the West that he for the first time learned the restrictions to which even an Emperor must submit. The Emperor, Ambrose had informed Valentinian II.,[7] is in the Church, not over it, and Theodosius in his public penance illustrated the enforcement of this principle. Yet Ambrose, while maintaining all through his life the legitimate prerogatives of the Church, cannot be said to have detracted in the least from the authority and deference due to the head of the State. In the matter of the basilica demanded by Justina he merely established a precedent, the justice of which is recognized to-day by all jurists in the United States—namely, that a church erected and dedicated to a given form of worship cannot be arbitrarily used for a totally different form of worship without the unanimous consent of the congregation. His attitude in the affair of the burned synagogues is usually regarded as more questionable, yet how entirely his objection was due to conscientious scruples is apparent from what he has written on this subject. But universal approval has been the reward for his noble letter to Theodosius on the massacre of Thessalonica. It was something new in the history of imperial Rome to find any man bold enough to rebuke the tyranny of an Emperor, whether pagan or Christian. The Christian Emperors, indeed, in the matter of arbitrariness, were little if any improvement over their pagan predecessors. The name of Constantine is stained with the judicial murder of his son and his wife; the cruelties of Valentinian I. were so dreadful as to raise the question of his sanity, while Theodosius had been guilty of the Thessalonica massacre, and this not at all on the impulse of the moment, but after he had promised Ambrose to exercise clemency. Yet these three Emperors were not merely the ablest who controlled the destinies of the empire in the fourth century, but in addition they were the Emperors who best understood what Christianity meant

[7] Sermo contra Auxent., 36.

to humanity. But with the pontificate of St. Ambrose a different state of things begins. The firm and respectful opposition of the great Bishop of Milan to imperial dictation in matters ecclesiastical, no less than his insistence that a Christian Emperor must respect the Christian moral code, marks the beginning of a tradition never to be lost sight of in the Christian West of subsequent ages. Unfortunately for the East, Constantinople produced no Ambrose. The nearest approach to him, St. John Chrysostom, lacked somewhat of the prudent firmness as well as the moral support of his people which made Ambrose victorious. Chrysostom's failure in the Eastern capital is in striking contrast to the victory of Ambrose in Milan. The lives of these two men mark the parting of the ways in the very different destinies of the two sections of Christendom. For the greater part of a century Eastern Christianity had been permitting Cæsar to exercise ever more and more the authority which belonged to the Church, whereas, in the West, during the same period, the consciousness of danger to religious liberty from the same source was gradually taking firm hold of the minds of the Western episcopate. St. Ambrose for the first time clearly defined the spheres of the two authorities and, more important still, in practice he was successful in having his definition accepted. His example was not to be forgotten in Latin Christendom, whereas in the East the death of Chrysostom in exile marked a new advance in the growing subjection of the Eastern Church to the despotism of the State.

Maurice M. Hassett.

Harrisburg, Pa.

THE CAPTURE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

THE Turks, primitively one of the numerous nomad tribes who roamed over Central and Eastern Asia, were first known to history by that name at the commencement of the sixth century. Founders of an empire which extended from the borders of Manchuria to the Carpathians, as Seljuk Sultans they governed the greater part of the Khalifs' dominions in Asia from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, extending the Mohammedan religion and rule into Anatolia and preparing the way for their successors, the Ottomans. First as captives and slaves of the Khalifs, then as a military aristocracy and subsequently as Seljukian Sultans they absorbed the power that once belonged to Arab and Persian, from the Oxus to the borders of Egypt and the Asiatic frontiers of the

Byzantine Empire. The wide empire of the Saracens became theirs, and the aid which Erotoghrul, son of Suleyman—a member of the Oghuz branch of the Turks—gave to Kay-Kubad, the Seljuk Sultan of Iconium, in resisting a Mongolian invasion near Angora, was the first step that led to the creation of the Ottoman Empire, which has for more than six hundred years been ruled by thirty-five Princes in the male line without a break in the succession. There is no such example, says Stanley Lane-Poole, of the continuous authority of a single family in the history of Europe.[1]

The Turkish capture of Constantinople, completing their conquest of the Balkan Peninsula, was the fulfillment of a dream. Othman or Osman, son of Ertoghrul, born in 1258, from whom the Osmanli or Ottomans derive their name—the first ruler of the line who declared his absolute independence—fell in love with the daughter of Edebali, a doctor of the law, at the little village of Itburuni, near Eskishehr. She was called Mal Khatun, or "lady treasure," and Kamariya, or "moonbright," from her surpassing beauty. The poet's words, "the course of true love never yet ran smooth," were antecedently verified in his case. Her father discouraged the suit until a dream prevailed where a lover's pleadings failed. One night Osman in a dream thought he saw himself and the old man stretched upon the ground, when from Edebali's breast there seemed to rise a moon, which, waxing to the full, approached the prostrate form of Osman and finally sank to rest in his bosom. Thereat from out his loins sprang forth a tree, which grew higher and higher and spread out its branches till the boughs overshadowed the earth and the seas. Under the canopy of leaves towered four mighty mountains, Caucasus and Atlas, Taurus and Haemus, which held up the leafy vault like four great tent poles, and from their sides flowed the Nile and Danube, the Tigris and Euphrates. Ships sailed upon the waters, harvests waved upon the fields, cities raised domes and minarets towards the green canopy; temples and obelisks, towers and fortresses arose and on their pinnacles shone the golden Crescent. As he gazed a great wind blew and dashed the Crescent against the crown of Constantine, that imperial city which stood at the meeting of two seas and two continents, like a diamond between sapphires and emeralds, the centre jewel of the ring of empire.[2] Osman was about to place the dazzling ring upon her finger when he awoke. He related his dream to her father, who, convinced of the great future thus foreshadowed for the offspring of Osman and the moon-faced damsel, consented to their union.

[1] "Turkey," by Stanley Lane-Poole, second edition. London: Fisher Unwin, 1889.

[2] Von Hammer, "Geschichte der Osmanischen Reichs" (I., 66-67). Quoted by Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

The stirring story of Osman's career, until death closed it at the age of seventy, after a reign of twenty-six years, is a record of rapidly succeeding conquests which brought the Turks nearer and nearer to the goal of their ambition—the seat of the Greek Empire. When he encountered the Byzantine army at Baphoeum, he routed it and ravaged the whole of Bithynia, so that the Greeks dared not venture outside the walls of Nicæa.[3] Brusa, one of the two chief cities held by the Greeks in Asia, surrendered in 1326 to Osman's son Orkhan, after a ten-years' siege, and was made the capital of the already expanding Ottoman Empire. While Nicæa, the cradle of the Greek Church, and which had been for two generations the capital of the Greek Empire, was closely blockaded, and Osman's flying cavalry ravaged the country as far as the Black Sea, the Emperor, standing on the towers of his palace at Constantinople, could see the flames of the burning villages across the Bosphorus. The immediate conquest of Nicæa and Nicomedia and the firm establishment of the Turks upon the shores of the Bosphorus quickly followed the death of "Black Osman,"[4] and in two generations the Turks found themselves masters of the whole of the northwest corner of Asia Minor and actually in sight of the then, as now, much-coveted prize destined to come into their possession. The Sultan, as he stood on the opposite shore of the Bosphorus, could see the domes and palaces of Constantinople, the metropolis of the decadent and doomed empire of the Palaeologi.

An alliance between the Turks and the Genoese, whom they aided in their conflict with the Venetians, the other great maritime power of the Mediterranean, and the most resolute opponents of the Crescent, led to the first entrance of the Ottomans upon European soil. Suleyman Pasha, Orkhan's eldest son, who had already operated with success in the Balkan provinces, crossed the Hellespont on a couple of rafts with eighty followers and took the castle of Tzympe, which in a few days was garrisoned with three thousand Ottoman soldiers. Cantazucenus, the Greek Emperor, who had given his daughter Theodora in marriage to the sexagenarian Moslem, Orkhan, was too busy with the hostility of his other son-in-law, John Palaeologus, to resist this unprovoked invasion; he even sought the assistance of the Sultan against his rival. More Turks were accordingly sent over to reinforce Suleyman's command. Palaeologus was beaten, but the Ottomans had won their foothold in Europe. In 1358 an earthquake overthrew the cities of Thrace.

[3] Finlay, "Hist. of Greece," III., 387.

[4] In accordance with his last wish, he was buried at Brusa, where his sepulchre existed up to the last century. His sword is still preserved at Constantinople, and each successive Sultan is invested with the founder's weapon at his coronation.

Houses crumbled to the ground, and even the walls and fortifications fell upon the trembling earth, while the terrified inhabitants fled from their shaking homes. Among the rest the walls around Gallipoli fell down, the people deserted the city, and over the ruins the Turks marched in. The Emperor in vain protested. Orkhan declared that Providence had opened the city to his troops, and he could not disregard so clear an instance of Divine interposition. The civil war which still raged left Cantazucenus small leisure for attending to anything but the attacks of Palaeologus. The shore of the Hellespont was quickly garrisoned with Ottoman soldiers, and the first fatal step had been permitted which led to the conquest of the empire and the perpetual menace of Europe for several centuries.[5]

Adrianople (1361) and Philippopolis were soon after taken by Amurath or Murad I., the successor of Orkhan, who died in 1359, and Macedonia and Roumelia became provinces of the Ottoman Empire, which in 1365 concluded a commercial treaty with the Republic of Ragusa, over which it assumed a protectorate. But the Turks had others to count with besides Greek degenerates, and, in view of recent events in the Balkan Peninsula, it is interesting and suggestive to recall that the stoutest resistance to their ownward march was made by Servians and Bulgarians. "To say nothing of danger from behind in Asia," says Lane-Poole, "there was a belt of warlike peoples beyond the Balkan, who weremade of very different stuff from the emasculate Greeks. Behind the empire were ranged the vigorous young Slavonic races of Servia and Bornia, the Bulgarians, and the Vlachs, with their traditions of Roman descent; the Skipitars of Albania, a hardy race of mountaineers, and, above all, the Magyars of Hungary, who, with their neighbors the Poles, formed for three centuries the chief bulwark of Christendom against the swelling tide of Mohammedan invasion. In 1364 the first encounter between the northern Christians and the invaders took place on the banks of the Maritza, near Adrianople, whither Louis I., King of Hungary and Poland, and the Princes of Bosnia, Servia and Wallachia, pushed forward to put an end once for all to the rule of the Ottomans in Europe."[6] But the end was not yet. The more alert Turks, although they were only half the number of the Christian troops, by a sudden night attack surprised and defeated the Hungarians at a spot which is known to this day in Turkish as Sirf Sindughi, or "Serbs' rout." The whole of ancient Thrace, except the country around Constantinople, was now in their grasp. In 1375 Nissa, the birthplace of Constantine the Great and one of the strongholds of the Byzantine Empire, capitulated after

[5] Stanley Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, pp. 34, 35.
[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

a twenty-five days' siege. Servia secured peace by agreeing to pay an annual tribute of a thousand pounds in silver and furnish a thousand horsemen to the Turkish army. Bulgaria sued for and obtained a respite by a matrimonial alliance, and the Greek Emperor declared himself a vassal of Murad, who in 1388, after suffering a defeat at the hands of a Slavonic crusade, led by Servia, Bosnia and Bulgaria, to expel the common enemy, conquered and annexed Bulgaria to the Ottoman Empire. But it was only to meet his death after the famous battle of Kosovo (1389), celebrated in Servian history, legend and patriotic ballad poetry, when Milosh Kobilovich, a Servian warrior, made his way into the Sultan's presence and plunged his dagger into his heart. Swift vengeance was taken by the Turks. The dying Sultan before he expired in his tent ordered the execution of Lazarus, the Servian Czar, and the assassin, whom the Servians have extolled as a national hero, was hewn to pieces by his guard. They wrecked little of human life in those days. Bajazet, or Bayezed, the new Sultan, who was proclaimed on the battlefield in the sight of the dead body of his father, slew his own brother, Ya'kub, although he had fought gallantly during that eventful day. The murder of their brothers became an established principle of Ottoman succession. Murad himself had put to death his son Saveji when he rebelled against him, and Bajazet was equally resolved to brook no brother near his throne.

He had soon to face a more formidable foe. The Pope in 1394 proclaimed a great Catholic crusade against the Moslems, led and organized by Sigismund, the chivalrous Catholic King of Hungary. The flower of European chivalry flocked to the standard of Sigismund, volunteers in a holy war, the object of which was to drive the Turks out of Europe, cross the Hellespont and rescue the Holy Land from the infidels. It might have been successful but for the abandonment of the Christian cause by the Servian King, who had given his sister to wife to the Sultan, and who, at the battle of Nicopolis, when the Magyars had driven back the Turkish janissaries and come to close quarters with the Spahis, whom they threatened to overthrow, led his five thousand Slavs upon the Christian troops and won the day for his Moslem master. Bajazet, who had sworn to stable his horse at the high altar of St. Peter's in Rome, as he rode among the heaps of slain, is related to have wept tears of rage to see how many of his bravest warriors had fallen before the furious onslaught of the French and the steady desperation of Sigismund's attack.[7]

True to the sanguinary traditions of his race, who revel in scenes of slaughter, he pitilessly butchered the majority of the ten thousand

[7] Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

prisoners of war, the remainder being sold as slaves. But when the power of this scourge of Christendom was at its zenith; when he had extended his sway over the Greek Empire as far as the Danube and over Asia to the banks of the Euphrates; when he dreamed, like Xerxes, of conquering a world and was about to realize his arrogant and impious threat of stabling his charger at the high altar of St. Peter's; when he had established his authority over the Peloponnesus and planted the Crescent upon the Acropolis of Athens; when his all but vanquished vassal, the Greek Emperor, consented to the building of a Mohammedan mosque and a Mohammedan college in the metropolis of schismatic Catholicity; when he had demanded the surrender of the Eastern City of the Cæsars, and, after a six years' siege, was on the point of capturing it, another and greater scourge, the terrible Tamerlane,[8] Timur the Tartar, called "The Wrath of God," swooped down upon the Ottoman Empire with his Asiatic hordes and shattered to pieces the proud power it had taken long years of hard fighting and oceans of blood to build up. Bajazet, taken prisoner on the fateful field of Angora (1402), became a part of his victor's pageant, condemned in fetters to follow his captor about in his pomps and campaigns, carried in a barred litter, which gave rise to the well-known legend that he was kept in an iron cage.[9] When, eight months later, Bajazet died in his chains and Tamerlane followed him to the grave two years afterwards, having overrun the Turkish Empire in Asia, occupied Nicæa, Brusa and the other chief cities on the coast, wrested Smyrna from the Knights of St. John and restored the various petty Princes of Asia to their former possessions, to all human seeming the days of the Turks as empire-builders had come and gone. Swept out of Asia, and with their European provinces menaced by Hungarians, Poles, Bulgarians, Albanians, Vlachs and other races, they seemed fallen, never to rise again. But, as a certain British statesman once said, the unexpected always happens. "The most astonishing characteristic of the rule of the Turks," observes Lane-Poole,[10] and the observation is just now very apposite and suggestive, "is its vitality. Again and again its doom has been pronounced by wise prophets, and still it survives. Province after province has been cut off the empire, yet still the Sultan sits supreme over wide dominions, and is reverenced or feared by subjects of many races. Considering how little of the great qualities of the ruler the Turk has often possessed, how little trouble he has taken to conciliate the subjects whom his sword has subdued, it is amazing how firm has

[8] Of Turkish race, born near Samarakand in 1333.
[9] Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
[10] *Ibid*, pp. 74, 75.

been his authority, how unshaken his power. At the moment when Timur's armies were ravaging the southern shores of the Bosphorus and the Greek Empire was almost rousing from its long sleep and retaking its lost provinces in Europe, the Turkish power might well be said to be annihilated; yet within a dozen years the lost provinces were reunited under the strong and able rule of Mohammed I. and the Ottoman Empire, far from being weakened by the apparently crushing blow it had received in 1402, rose stronger and more vigorous after its fall, and, like a giant refreshed, prepared for new and bolder feats of conquest."

Its boldest feat was the capture of Constantinople, bolder, because achievable and achieved, than Orkhan's insane idea of exterminating Christianity by educating Christian children—a policy which has found servile copyists in the present rulers of France. It took three sieges to accomplish the conquest. Bajazet first laid siege to it. Musa, an elder brother of Mohammed I., whose right to the Sultanate he contested after waging war on the Servians, during which he feasted his officers upon tables constructed of the corpses of three Serb garrisons, besieged the imperial city for the second time (1413), being killed in flight when routed by Stephen, King of Servia. It was reserved to Mahomet or Mohammed II. to capture it after a siege, ever memorable in history, Mohammed I. having preluded it by transferring the capital of the Ottoman Empire from Asia to Europe, from Brusa to Adrianople. The Greek Emperors precipitated it by their folly, first by permitting the erection of a Turkish mosque within its walls—giving the followers of Mahomet a foothold in the metropolis of Greek Christianity, adding constructive semi-apostasy to the sin of schism—and secondly, by espousing the cause of rival claimants to the Sultan's throne. The Greeks had degenerated in mind as well as in morals. They had lost that subtlety with which as a race they are commonly credited, and were outwitted by the Turks, who have shown themselves as astute in diplomacy as they are brave in action. The Christian powers might easily have expelled them from Europe when Timur broke up their empire, but they let the opportunity slip and allowed them time to reform their procedure, recover lost ground and prepare for fresh conquests. The Emperor Constantine Palaeologus, destined to be the last of his line, made the last stand behind the beleaguered walls of Constantinople against the resuscitated power of the Osmanli. But it was too late—too late to repair a fatal mistake, to save the last remnant of his empire from a typical Oriental despot, a monster whose first act in his accession was to murder his baby brother, and whose cruelty, perfidy and sensuality could not be concealed or condoned by the purchased praises of

hired panegyrists who extolled him as "the Father of Good Works" and "the Sire of Victory."

Mohammed II. commenced operations by the erection of a fortress outside the gates of Constantinople. Mohammed I. had already erected one called "the Castle of Annatolia" on the Asiatic shore, a menace to the Emperor Manuel; Mohammed II. built the "Castle of Roumelia" on the opposite side, and both still stand, guarding the Bosphorus.

Gibbon in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire"[11] has told the story of the conquest of Constantinople, one of the great turning points of history, an epoch-making event, as its re-conquest will doubtless be some day or other. The siege began on April 6, 1453. Of the triangle which composes the figure of the imperial city, the two sides along the sea were made inaccessible to an enemy—the Propontis by nature, and the harbor by art. Between the two waters, the basis of the triangle, the land side was protected by a double wall and a deep ditch of the depth of one hundred feet. Against this line of fortification, which Phranza, an eye-witness, prolongs to the measure of six miles, the Ottomans directed their principal attack, and the Emperor, after distributing the service and command of the most perilous stations, undertook the defense of the external wall. In the first days of the siege the Greek soldiers descended into the ditch or sallied into the field; but they soon discovered that in the proportion of their numbers one Christian was of more value than twenty Turks; and after these bold preludes they were prudently content to maintain the rampart with their missile weapons. "Nor," comments Gibbon, "should this prudence be accused of pusillanimity. The nation was indeed pusillanimous and base, but the last Constantine deserves the name of a hero; his noble band of volunteers was inspired with Roman virtue, and the foreign auxiliaries supported the honor of the Western chivalry." Gibbon goes on to narrate how the Turkish approaches were soon sunk in trenches or covered with ruins; how inadequate was the Christians' stock of gunpowder and how weak their ordnance, while the great cannon of Mahomet—an important and visible object in the history of the times—was flanked by two fellows almost of equal magnitude; how fourteen Turkish batteries thundered at once on the most accessible places, and how the Turks, pushing their approaches to the edge of the ditch, attempted to fill the enormous chasm and to build a road to the assault. Innumerable fascines, and hogsheads, and trunks of trees were heaped on each other, and such was the impetuosity of the throng that the foremost and the weakest were pushed headlong down the precipice or instantly

[11] Dean Milman's edition, VIII., 159 *et seq.*

buried under the accumulated mass. To fill the ditch was the toil of the besiegers; to clear away the rubbish was the safety of the besieged; and after a long and bloody conflict the web that had been woven in the day was again unraveled in the night. The next resource of Mahomet was mining, but the soil was rocky; in every attempt he was stopped and undermined by the Christian engineers. Nor had the art been yet invented of replenishing those subterraneous passages with gunpowder and blowing whole towers and cities into the air.

A circumstance that distinguishes the siege of Constantinople, the historian notes, is the reunion of the ancient and modern artillery. The cannon were intermingled with the mechanical engines for casting stones and darts; the bullet and the battering ram were directed against the walls. Nor had the discovery of gunpowder superseded the use of the liquid and inextinguishable fire. A wooden turret of the largest size was advanced on rollers; this portable magazine of ammunition and fascines was protected by a threefold covering of bulls' hides; incessant volleys were securely discharged from the loopholes; in front three doors were converted for the sally and retreat of the soldiers and workmen. They ascended by a staircase to the upper platform, and as high as the level of that platform a scaling ladder could be raised by pulleys to form a bridge and grapple with the adverse rampart. By this means the tower of St. Romanus was overturned. After a severe struggle the Turks were repulsed from the breach nd interrupted by darkness; but they trusted that with the return of light they would be able to renew the attack with fresh vigor and decisive success. The Emperor and Justiniani, availing of this pause in the action, passed the night on the spot, urging on the labors upon which depended the safety of the Church and the city. At dawn the Sultan saw with astonishment and chagrin that his wooden turret had been reduced to ashes, the ditch cleared and restored and the tower of St. Germanus repaired and strengthened. At this point five Genoese ships forced the Turkish blockade and brought provisions and relief to the garrison. "The situation of the imperial city," observes Gibbon, "was strong against her enemies and accessible to her friends, and a rational and moderate armament of the maritime States might have saved the relics of the Roman name and maintained a Christian fortress in the heart of the Ottoman Empire. Yet this was the sole and feeble attempt for the deliverance of Constantinople."

The reduction of the city appeared to be hopeless unless a double attack could be made from the harbor as well as from the land; but the harbor was inaccessible, an impenetrable chain of eight large

and twenty smaller vessels with several galleys and sloops interposing a barrier. The Turks might apprehend a naval sally and a second encounter in the open seas. In this perplexity Mahomet, by a bold stroke, transported by land his lighter vessels and military stores from the Bosphorus into the higher part of the harbor, a distance of ten miles. A road had to be opened behind the suburb of Galata; this free passage or total destruction depended on the option of the Genoese. A level way over the uneven ground was made by covering it with a broad platform of strong and solid planks, and to render them more slippery and smooth they were anointed with the fat of shep and oxen. Fourscore eight galleys or large boats and brigantines of fifty and thirty oars were disembarked on the Bosphorus shore, arranged successively on rollers and drawn forward by the power of men and pulleys. Two guides or pilots were stationed at the helm and the prow of each vessel, the sails were unfurled to the winds, and the labor, as is the wont of sailors in all ages ever since "men went down to the sea in ships," was cheered by song and acclatmation. In the course of a single night the little Turkish fleet painfully climbed the hill, steered over the plain and was launched from the declivity into the shallow waters of the harbor, far above the molestations of the Greek vessels of deeper draught. As soon as the Ottomans occupied the upper harbor with a fleet and army they constructed, in the narrowest part, a pontoon or bridge formed of casks and hogsheads, joined with rafters linked with iron and covered with planks. On this floating battery was planted one of the largest cannon, while the fourscore galleys, with troops and scaling ladders, approached the most accessible side. In vain the Greeks tried at night to set fire to the vessels and the bridge. Turkish vigilance prevented their approach; their foremost galliots were sunk or taken; forty youths, the bravest of Italy and Greece, were inhumanly massacred, and in retaliation the Greek Emperor exposed from the city walls the heads of 260 Mussulman prisoners.

After a siege of forty days the fate of Constantinople could no longer be averted. The diminutive garrison was exhausted by a double attack; fortifications which had stood for ages against hostile violence were dismantled on all sides by the Ottoman cannin. Many breaches were made, and near the gate of St. Romanus four towers were leveled to the ground. For the payment of his troops Constantine despoiled the churches under promise of fourfold restitution. A spirit of discord reigned in his camp. The Emperor was upbraided for refusing a timely surrender, and, like the Israelites who sighed for the fleshpots of Egypt, the faint-hearted sighed for the repose and security of Turkish servitude in face of impending

famine, while the more religious minded carried in solemn procession the statue of Our Lady, whom they invoked in their dire distress. The noblest of the Greeks and the bravest of their allies were summoned to the palace to prepare them for the last general assault. "The last speech of Palaeologus," says Gibbon, "was the funeral oration of the Roman Empire; he promised, he conjured and he vainly attempted to infuse the hope which was extinguished in his own mind." The pathetic scene is described by the historian Phranza, who was present at this mournful meeting. They wept, they embraced each other; regardless of their families and fortunes, they devoted their lives, and each commander, departing to his station, maintained all night a vigilant and anxious watch on the rampart. The Emperor and some faithful companions entered St. Sophia, which in a few hours was to be converted into a mosque, and devoutly, with tears and fervent prayers, received Holy Communion. After some brief moments of repose in the palace, which resounded with cries and lamentations, and having solicited the forgiveness of all whom he might have injured, he mounted on horseback to visit the guards and reconnoitre the movements of the enemy. "The distress and fall of the last Constantine," says the English historian, "are more glorious than the long prosperity of the Byzantine Cæsars."

The momentous and decisive general attack took place on the morning of May 29, 1453. The Turkish galleys almost touched with their prows and scaling ladders the less defensible walls of the harbor. Under pain of death silence was enjoined. At daybreak, without the customary signal of the morning gun, the Turks assaulted the city by sea and land. The most audacious of the motley crowd, the refuse of the ranks, who first climbed the walls were instantly precipitated. Not an arrow or a bullet of the Christians was wasted. But their strength and ammunition were exhausted in the last laborious effort to repulse the besiegers. The ditch was quickly filled with the bodies of the slain and made a foothold for their companions who followed. The troops of Anatolia and Roumelia were successively led to the charge. Their progress was various and doubtful, and after a two-hours' conflict the Greeks still maintained and improved their advantages, while the office of the Emperor was raised, rallying and encouraging his soldiers to achieve by a final effort the deliverance of their country. At that critical moment the janissaries rushed forward. The Sultan himself on horseback, with an iron mace in his hand, was the spectator of their prowess. Surrounded by ten thousand of his domestic troops, whom he reserved for decisive occasions, he directed the order of battle. His numerous Ministers of Justice were posted

behind the line to urge, to restrain and to punish, and if danger was in the front, shame and inevitable death were in the rear of fugitives. The cries of fear and pain were drowned in martial music. From the lines, the galleys and the bridge the Ottoman artillery thundered on all sides, and camp and city, Greek and Turks were involved in a cloud of smoke. The immediate loss of Constantinople, Gibbon assumes, may be ascribed to the bullet or arrow which pierced the gauntlet of John Justiniani. The sight of his blood and the acute pain appalled the courage of the chief, whose arms and counsel were the firmest ramparts of the city.

The Turks far outnumbered the Christians.[12] The double walls were reduced by their cannon to a heap of ruins, and if the besiegers could penetrate at a single point the whole city was irrecoverably lost. The first to enter it was the Janissary Hassan, a man of gigantic stature and strength. With his scimitar in one hand and his buckler in the other, he ascended the outer fortifications. Of the thirteen janissaries who were emulous of his valor, eighteen perished in the bold adventure. Hassan and his twelve companions had reached the summit; the giant was precipitated from the ramparts; he rose on one knee and was again oppressed by a shower of darts and stones. But his success had proved that the achievement was possible; the walls and towers were instantly covered with a swarm of Turks, and the Greeks, now driven from the vantage ground, were overwhelmed by increasing multitudes. Amidst these multitudes the Emperor, who accomplished all the duties of a general and a soldier, was long seen and finally lost. The nobles who fought round his person sustained till their last breath the honorable names of Palaeologus and Cantazucene. His mournful exclamation was heard: "Cannot there be found a Christian to cut off my head?" and his last fear was that of falling alive into the hands of the infidels. He had cast aside the purple. Amidst the tumult he fell by an unknown hand, and his body was buried under a monument of the slain. After his death resistance and order were no more. The Greeks fled towards the city, and many were pressed or stifled in the narrow pass of the gate of St. Romanus. The victorious Turks rushed through the breaches of the inner walls, and as they advanced into the streets they were soon joined by their brethren, who had fought and forced the gate of Phenar on the side of the harbor. In the first heat of the pursuit about two thousand Christians were put to the sword. The victors acknowledged that they should immediately have given quarter if the valor of the Emperor and his chosen bands had not prepared them for a similar

[12] The investing army comprised three hundred thousand men, and the Turkish fleet consisted of three hundred galleys.

opposition in every part of the capital. It was thus, after a siege of fifty-three days, that Constantinople, which had defied the power of Chosroes, the Chakan and the Caliphs, was subdued by the arms of Mahomet II. Her empire had been subverted by the Latins; her religion was trampled in the dust by her Moslem conquerors.

The houses and convents were at once deserted; the trembling inhabitants flocked together in the streets like a herd of timid animals. From every part of the capital people poured into the Church of St. Sophia. In the space of an hour sanctuary, choir, nave and galleries were filled with a multitude of men, women and children, priests, monks and nuns; the doors were barred on the inside, and they sought safety and protection within its sacred precincts. But the doors were speedily broken with axes from without, and as the Turks on entering encountered no armed resistance, they promptly took them all prisoners. Youth, beauty and the appearance of wealth attracted their choice, and the right of property was decided among them by a prior seizure, by personal strength and by the authority of command in the space of an hour. Male captives were bound with cords, the females with their veils and girdles; the Senators were linked with their slaves, prelates with the porters of the church and young men of a plebeian class with noble maids, whose faces had been invisible to the sun and their nearest kindred. In this common captivity the ranks of society were confounded, the ties of nature were cut asunder and the inexorable soldier was careless of the father's groans, the tears of the mother and the lamentations of the children. The loudest in their wailings were the nuns, who were torn from the altar with naked bosoms, outstretched hands and disheveled hair. Whole strings of unfortunate Greeks were driven through the streets, and as their captors were eager to return for more prey, their trembling pace was quickened with menaces and blows. Simultaneously a similar rapine took place in all the churches and monasteries, in all the palaces and dwellings in the city. No place, however sacred or sequestered, could protect the persons or property of the Greeks. About sixty thousand were transported to the camp or the fleet, exchanged or sold, according to the interest or caprice of their masters and dispersed in remote servitude through the provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

From the first hour of the memorable 29th of May disorder and rapine prevailed in Constantinople till the eighth hour of the same day, when the Sultan himself passed in triumph through the gate of St. Romanus, attended by his vezirs, pashas and guards, gazing with satisfaction and wonder on the strange though splendid appearance of the domes and palaces, so dissimilar from the style of Ottoman architecture. At the principal door of St. Sophia he alighted

from his horse and entered the dome, and such was his jealous regard for that monument of his triumph that, on observing a Moslem in the act of breaking the marble pavement, he admonished him with his scimitar that if the spoil and captives were granted to the soldiers, the public and private buildings were reserved for the Prince. By his command the magnificent metropolitan church of the East was transformed into a Mohammedan mosque; the rich altar requisites were removed, the crosses pulled down and the walls, adorned with sacred images and mosaics, restored to a state of naked simplicity. On the same day, or on the ensuing Friday, the muezzin ascended the highest turret and proclaimed the azan or call to prayer, the Imam preached and Mahomet II. performed the *namaz* thanksgiving at the high altar, where Mass had so lately been celebrated before the last of the Cæsars. From St. Sophia he proceeded to the deserted palace of one hundred successors of the great Constantine, but which in a few hours had been stripped of the pomp of royalty. A melancholy reflection on the vicissitudes of human greatness forced itself upon his mind, as he repeated a distich of Persian poetry:

> Now the spider draws the curtain in the Caesar's palace hall,
> And the owl proclaims the watch beneath Afrasiab's vaulted dome.[13]

Over five centuries and a half have elapsed since the great imperial city, the Queen of the East, the rival of ancient Rome, founded by Constantine the Great in A. D. 326, passed from the possession of a Christian to a Mohammedan power, which still retains it, though on sufferance, and with it the beautiful basilica upon which Constantine and his son and successor lavished so much wealth. It was almost completely destroyed by fire during the disturbances fomented by the heretics against St. John Chrysostom when that great Doctor occupied the Patriarchal See of Constantinople; was repaired by Arcadius and Theodosius, and reconstructed by Justinian, who, when his ten thousand workmen had finished their labor of love and he beheld the stupendous central dome crowning the sacred edifice, adorned with spoils from the proudest pagan temples of Greece and Italy and radiant with arabesques, mosaics, marbles of various hues, gold and silver ornaments and precious stones, exclaimed in a transport of religious enthusiasm: "Thanks be to God, who has deemed me worthy to accomplish such a work!"

Although the Crescent has long replaced the Cross on the summit of the superb temple erected to "Holy Wisdom"—Hagia Sophia—one of the grandest achievements of Christian architecture, the inextinguishable hope is cherished that some day—may it be not far distant—it will be restored to Catholic worship and resound once more with pealing anthems. A tradition exists that at the moment

[13] Gibbon, "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," c. lxviii.

the infidels penetrated into it a priest, bearing the consecrated Host from the sanctuary, was endeavoring to escape. Perceived by the janissaries and pursued, he fled towards a door leading to one of the galleries. The instant he had crossed the threshold the aperture was closed by a solid wall of masonry—

> But through the countries round about, the faithful people say,
> In better times, in future years, there yet shall come a day
> When, held once more by Christian men, through Saint Sophia's fane,
> The glories of the ancient faith shall shine and sound again.
> Then shall the walls once more unclose, a sight for joy and fear,
> And, with the Host between his hands, the priest shall reappear.[14]

R. F. O'Connor.

Cork, Ireland.

PRAGMATISM.

I.—ITS CONCEPT OF TRUTH.

OF LATE the world has heard much of Pragmatism. Two years ago the name was hardly known; then it was heralded abroad by Professor James, of Harvard, in his popular lectures on philosophy, and now Pragmatism is on philosophical lips, Pragmatism is in philosophic halls, and philosophic heads are puzzling over pragmatic doctrines. Who are the Pragmatists? What is Pragmatism? What new doctrines does Pragmatism offer? To number the Pragmatists is an easy task; to define Pragmatism is not so easy, and still less easy is it to follow pragmatic doctrines. Pragmatism ought to be a good thing; it is the new philosophy, and newness and goodness are nowadays almost synonymous. Then it takes its name from the Greek word pragma, which, according to James, means practical. Pragmatism looks to the practical and insists on practical results. This looks well, for the world to-day is essentially practical and demands even a practical philosophy. But, then, the new philosophy forms a basis for the new theology, and this, at least for Catholics, marks it as an object of suspicion. What is more, Pragmatism, its supporters declare, is grossly misunderstood. That looks bad, for a practical philosophy ought to be clear and easily intelligible to all.

Despite this difficulty, however, perhaps because of it, Pragmatism has spread rapidly. It has taken root in France, Italy, England and in our own country. In France the movement is identified with

[14] "Capture of Byzantium," by T. D. Sullivan.

Modernism in theology, and its leaders are Le Roy, Bergson and Poincaré. In Italy a young band of avowed Pragmatists is led by Signor Giovanni Papini, who is editor of their militant organ, the *Leonardo.* The English exponent of the new doctrines is F. C. S. Schiller, whose "Studies in Humanism," a comparatively recent work, is a strong plea for Pragmatism. In America James, of Harvard, and Dewey, of Columbia, are leaders of the movement. A list of other eminent scientists, more or less sympathetic with Pragmatism, may be found in the preface to "Studies in Humanism."

Here are Pragmatists enough, but, strange to say, from the mass of their writings it is difficult to gather a clear idea of just what Pragmatism is. "For the Pragmatist," says Bakewell, of Yale, "is an illusive person. Just when you think you have caught his meaning you find him saying something that takes it all back." He brings back through the window what he has previously turned out of the door. The eminent Papini accepts the difficulty and denies the possibility of its solution, for he declares: "Whoever should define Pragmatism in a few words would be doing the most anti-pragmatic thing imaginable. In fact, he who would try to include in a single phrase all the tendencies that make up Pragmatism would surely be doing something generic and incomplete, and Pragmatists despise nothing so much as a vagueness and indefiniteness."[1]

The utter hopelessness of any clearness in the matter is, perhaps, best proved by a writer in the *Journal of Philosophy,* who claims to have solved the difficulty. His solution consists of thirteen Pragmatisms, with a definition for each.[2] Such a solution, if solution it can be called, is clearly the only possible one, if we consider the broad field which Pragmatism aims at covering, for, according to James, "it is evident that the name applies itself to a number of tendencies that have hitherto lacked a collective name."[3] "It harmonizes with many ancient philosophic tendencies. It agrees with nominalism, for instance, in always appealing to particulars; with utilitarianism in emphasizing practical aspects; with positivism in its disdain of verbal solutions, useless questions and metaphysical abstractions."[4]

Pragmatism, however, is more than a mere synthesis of many old errors; it advances a few new ones of its own, or at least old ones in a new dress. One of these, and a fundamental part of the system, for they must stand or fall together, is its theory of truth. Professor James exposes this theory in the sixth of his popular lectures,

[1] *Popular Science Monthly,* October, 1907.
[2] *Cf. Journal of Philosophy and Psychology,* January 2 and 16, 1908.
[3] "Pragmatism," Longmans, Green & Co., 1907, p. 47.
[4] *Opus cit,* p. 53.

"Pragmatism's Conception of Truth." Before we let him state his position we must note emphatically that we are not here considering the meaning which Professor James, following Schiller's lead, attaches to the word "reality," nor are we considering just how far our intellect may advance in its search for truth, nor what kind of certainty that truth may have. What we wish to discover is whether or not James has rendered any service to philosophy when he rejects the old-time notion of truth and substitutes in its place a truth which is no longer immutable, no longer consists in an equality between the intellect and reality, but in something which leads towards or approximates reality, in something which is perpetually changing, which is useful in getting along mentally, but which, nevertheless, may be false to-morrow as out of harmony with to-morrow's new experiences. In other words, has James helped matters along when he tells us that the assertion, I know that a thing is so, *i. e.,* I am in possession of truth about it, besides its ordinary meaning, may and at times does signify, I don't know that the thing is false, or, I know approximately that it is so, or, I know that it may be so or may not be so. Such a twisting of a clear assertion sounds rather shocking in an intellectual sense, yet this is what James' new definition of truth brings us to when it is reduced to practice, and a practical view certainly a Pragmatist ought to be willing to take of it.

In developing this idea of truth James started with the following fact: We are told that the idea has grown amongst experimental scientists of late that the laws they deduce are only approximations. No one of them, then, is absolutely a transcript of reality, yet any one may, from some point of view, prove helpful. Their great use is to summarize old facts and to lead to new ones. They are only a conceptual shorthand in which we write our reports of nature. The atomic theory of the chemists will serve as an illustration. No chemist accepts this theory as absolutely true, but in it is conveniently summed up all that the chemists have in the past discovered. Pragmatism, then, applies this view of the laws of science to our ideas themselves.[5] "Any idea that will carry us prosperously from any part of our experience to any other part, linking things satisfactorily, working securely, simplifying, saving labor, is true for just so much, true in so far, true instrumentally."[6] "The individual has a stock of old opinions already, but he meets a new experience that puts them to a strain."[7] "The result is an inward trouble, to which his mind had till then been a stranger, and from which he seeks to escape by modifying his previous mass of opinions. He

[5] *Cf. opus cit,* p. 57 passim.
[6] *Opus cit,* p. 581.
[7] P. 59.

saves as much of it as he can. . . . So he tries to change first this opinion, and then that, until at last some new idea comes up which he can graft upon the ancient stock with a minimum of disturbance of the latter, some idea that mediates between the stock and the new experience and runs them into one another most felicitously and expediently."[8] "New truth is always a go between, a smoother over of transitions. It marries old opinion to new fact, so as ever to show a minimum of jolt, a maximum of continuity. We hold a theory true just in proportion to its success in solving this 'problem of maxima and minima.' "[9] But success in solving it is a matter of approximation and depends entirely upon the individual. Day after day the new contents are only added. The new details themselves are not true; "truth is what we say about them, and when we say that they have come, truth is satisfied with the plain additive formula."[10] "Further, true ideas are those we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify."[11] "Truth happens to an idea. It becomes true, is made true by events. Its verity is in fact an event, a process, the process, viz., of its verifying itself, its verification."[12] According to all this, as one of the critics of French Pragmatism puts it, "truth is said to be wholly in us and from us, not a matter of contemplation, but of action; not unchangeable and eternal, but changeable and partial."[13] " 'The true," to put it very briefly, "is only the expedient in our way of thinking; just as 'the right' is only the expedient in our way of behaving."[14] Truth is that which is useful, that which works. It may be remarked here that when Pragmatism speaks of utility and workableness as the norm of truth, or asks for the cash value of ideas, it speaks primarily of usefulness in the intellectual sense of what will lead us on to other fruitful ideas or to make prosperous connection with experience.

In this system, then, truth is in mutation, for that which is expedient and useful to-day may prove to be inexpedient and useless to-morrow; that idea which coördinates and marries the experiences of the past may be set in contradiction by the experience of the following year, just as the discovery of new scientific facts is the death of old scientific hypotheses. There can be no doubt that the mutability of truth is exactly what James maintains. Here are his words: "Meanwhile we have to live to-day by what truth we can get to-day and be ready to call it falsehood to-morrow. Ptolemaic

[8] *Opus cit*, p. 60.
[9] P. 61.
[10] *Opus cit*, p. 62.
[11] *Opus cit*, p. 201.
[12] *Opus cit*, p. 201.
[13] *Messenger*, July, 1908, book review, "La Notion de Vérité."
[14] James, *opus cit*, p. 222.

astronomy, Euclidean space, Aristotelian logic, scholastic metaphysics were expedient for centuries, but human experience has boiled over those limits, and we now call those things only relatively true, or true within those borders of experience."[15]

Nor can there be any doubt but that James is predicting mutability of truth taken in an unrestricted sense and looked at in itself and not with regard to our grasp of it. For if he merely meant that provisional truth is mutable, *i. e.,* that theories are mutable, or that our grasp of truth may become broader and deeper as days go on, his doctrine on this point would be as old as the hills, would be easily understood and would raise no quarrel with the intellectualists. Yet he tells us that his theory of truth is something very new in philosophy, is "abominably misunderstood," and is a scandal to all intellectualists. "The most fateful point of difference," he says, "between being a rationalist and being a pragmatist is now fully in sight. Experience is in mutation, and our psychological attainments of truth are in mutation—so much rationalism will allow, but never that reality itself or truth itself is mutable."[16]

One would imagine, then, that in this system there is no room for immutable truth, but this is not so; for "relations among purely mental ideas form another sphere where true and false beliefs maintain, and here the beliefs are absolute or unconditional." "Truth here has an eternal character."[17] It is just at this point that the vagueness and indefiniteness of the system manifests itself. We put a fair question: Is immutability, then, only an *accident of some truth,* or are there *two kinds* of truth, *specifically different*—truth as hitherto known, *i. e.,* immutable truth, and mutable truth? With the statement that some truth is immutable, absolute, we have no fault to find; we admit it, we maintain it; nay, more, we say all truth, if only it be truth, is immutable, absolute. Mutability, however, as applied to truth, falls strangely on philosophic ears. It recalls the days of Protagoras and the sophists. For, suppose truth is mutable, then the truth of this new idea of truth is also mutable and can fail us. How far shall we trust it, then, how far shall we follow it, how far shall we allow ourselves to be guided by it? As far as it is useful? But many find it useless, for if the truth of this new concept of truth is mutable, we shall ever be finding a new idea of truth, and who does not see that this is worse than mental anarchy? Or do Pragmatists claim immutability for the truth of this new concept of truth? Again we ask, is truth mutable, and if it is mutable, can it be called truth?

---

[15] *Opus cit,* p. 223.
[16] *Opus cit,* p. 226.
[17] *Opus cit,* p. 209.

Here an investigation of the analogy on which is founded the pragmatic concept of truth will be of great service. The scientist in advancing a theory to explain discovered facts seeks to find out the absolute solution of his riddle. He wishes to know the objective reasons for certain phenomena, *i. e.,* how things are really and objectively, not how they may be *conceived* by him. The scientist, then, works on the supposition that there is an absolute solution of his difficulties, one and only one; in other words, that there is one true solution, one truth with regard to the point in question. He also starts out in his quest from certain fixed and fundamental principles, which he holds as true and certain, principles true in the past, true now, and which will be true forever. But the scientist makes a clear-cut distinction between the word *"true"* as applied to his *fundamental principles* and *"true"* as applied to his theories. The first he calls true *strictly* and without qualification; the second he calls true *analogically* and qualified by a restrictive epithet, viz., true provisionally. Hence in the scientific field we find a well-marked distinction between *"truth"* and *"provisional truth."* Now when James applies the analogy of *truth* in experimental science to *truth* in philosophy, though he admits certain truths as absolutely and immutably true, still he denies that immutability is an essential attribute or quality of *truth,* even when that word is used in its strictest and most unqualified sense. This denial, however, is certainly not founded on the analogy of truth in experimental science.

In thus insisting upon the mutable nature of truth and claiming that it is "only the expedient in our way of thinking" and the "expedient in almost any fashion,"[18] James evidently rejects the old view that when there is truth there is an agreement of the mind with the object, that the mind copies the object, that there is an equation between the mind and the object. Now an equation is a static relation, and once true is always true; likewise truth founded on such a static relation is always and immutably true.

James, however, while he repudiates the old notion of truth, does not deny to his truth all agreement with reality. He says: "Our true ideas of sensible things do indeed copy them;" and again: "To copy a reality is one very important way of agreeing with it."[19] Still James admits that such agreement with reality "is far from being essential;" what is essential is agreement with reality in a broad sense. "To agree in the widest sense with reality," he says, "can only mean to be guided straight up to it or into its surroundings, or to be put into such working touch with it as to handle it or something connected with it better than if we disagreed. And often

[18] P. 222.

[19] Pp. 199 and 213.

agreement will mean only the negative fact that nothing contradictory comes from the quarter of reality to interfere in the way in which our ideas guide us elsewhere."[20] "Such, then, is the large, loose way in which the Pragmatist interprets the word agreement. He lets it cover any process of conduction from a present idea to a future terminus, provided only it run prosperously."[21]

Now it is just in this large, loose way that we refuse to interpret the phrase "agreement with reality." To treat anything in a large, loose way is a journeyman's treatment of it, not a master's, and a master's treatment of the definition of truth is required of the philosopher under pain of hopelessly confusing the world of intellect. James in this point contradicts a principle laid down by himself. He says: "We must talk consistently, just as we think consistently. Names are arbitrary, but once understood they must be kept. We must not now call Abel Cain or Cain Abel. If we do, we ungear ourselves from the whole book of Genesis."[22] And yet, with an arbitrariness all his own, James twists the word "agreement" from the sense in which it has always been understood and makes it cover his large, loose, shadowy, negative agreement with reality. Thus it is evident that with James the phrase "agreement with reality" stands for two things specifically different. First, it may mean what the intellectualists mean by it, viz., an agreement by which the mind is a copy of the reality. This is what one might call *absolute* agreement with reality, absolute in the sense that there is a static relation. The second meaning which James attaches to the phrase it that loose, shadowy agreement, often meaning "only the *negative* fact that nothing comes from the quarter of reality to interfere in the way our ideas lead us elsewhere."[23] This we might fitly characterize as *negative* or *provisional* agreement with reality—provisional in the sense that there is no static relation. Now it is evident that these two agreements, though covered by the same word, have very different meanings. A copy of reality is certainly quite another thing from a large, loose agreement with reality or conduction up into the quarter of reality.[24] Now James agrees with the intellectualist on the generic definition of truth as being "an agreement of the mind with reality." Where we differ, he says, is in interpreting the word agreement.[25] If, then, truth is the agreement of the mind with reality and there are two kinds of such agreement possible, two kinds of agreement specifically different, viz.,

[20] P. 213.
[21] P. 215.
[22] P. 214.
[23] P. 213.
[24] P. 215 passim.
[25] P. 198 passim.

absolute and provisional, it follows that the truths founded on two such specifically different agreements must themselves be specifically different. Ideas founded on absolute agreement with reality, which therefore represent the object as it is, would always work, would always be true from the impossibility of anything harmful coming to them from future experience. Ideas founded on provisional agreement with reality might be contradicted by future experience, and thus losing their usefulness become inexpedient. Such ideas would correspond to the *theories* of the scientists. Ideas founded on absolute agreement would correspond to their fundamental principles.

Thus it is clear that with James all truth cannot be the same, but that he is logically forced to admit two specifically different classes of ideas, one of absolutely true ideas, one of those only provisionally true. And yet, such being the case, James applies to two such radically different sets of ideas the single unqualified name of truth. Hence it happens that he speaks of truth as mutable, for *some* of his truth is mutable, being founded only on provisional agreement with reality and amounting at most to a theory. Now theories are mutable. But, in the light of what has been said, how can James assert without qualification *truth is mutable?* For, as we have seen, according to him *truth* may mean two things—*absolute truth* and *provisional truth.* Such a statement, then—*truth* is *mutable*—cannot as it stands be logically admitted by James, nor can it be denied; it must be distinguished thus: Truth is mutable—*absolute truth* is mutable—this is false; *provisional truth* is mutable—this is true. If James, then, gives both these classes of truth the single unqualified name *"truth,"* he may not be calling Cain Abel, but he is engendering as much confusion as if he did; he is calling Cain and Abel by the single name Abel. Either he must show that the name *"truth"* is applied to both these classes of ideas in the same sense—and this he cannot do—or grant that, being specifically different, they should have different names—immutable ideas being called without qualification simply "true," as they have ever been called; mutable ideas being called provisionally, conditionally *"true."* For if this be not done, and I am to speak of a mere chemical hypothesis as "true" because it works, and apply the same term "true" without any qualification to such a proposition as $2+2=4$, it is evident that I am throwing my intellectual life into hopeless confusion. Thus far at least Pragmatism does not make for clearness, practicability and action, and as a Pragmatist James has no right to call his provisional ideas, or ideas in process of verification, *"true,"* whether they work or not. If he insists on calling them true—and true in the strict sense they are not—let them be called *"provisionally true."* For we do not

deny the existence of such ideas or their usefulness. They are the laborious results of patient research, praiseworthy attempts to explain various parts of our experience, ideas working to-day, expedient to-morrow, probably becoming falsified the day after, restated again in the future, and, it may be, establishing themselves finally as absolutely true. And yet, admitting all this, we hold fast to the principle that alongside of such ideas there is a parallel growth of absolutely and eternally true ideas—ideas always expedient, always working, never true to-day and false to-morrow. Such ideas are the only ideas that merit the unrestricted name of truth.

In the light of what has been said, Pragmatists would do well to meditate on the utterance of George Stewart Fullerton in his recent essay on "The New Realism."[26] "I think it worth while," he says, "to dwell upon the truth that it is not well to emphasize excessively the uncertainty or unreality of human knowledge and the ignorance of man. . . . We are told that science is all very well in its own sphere, but that it cannot give us the real truth about things; or we are warned that the concepts of science are self-contradictory and will not bear careful scrutiny. . . . Molecules, atoms, the ether and what not may conceivably be swept into the shadowy realms of exploded beliefs. Nevertheless, our common experience of the worlds of matter and of mind would remain unshaken, and with it a *vast number* of *truths* which men have *never doubted* and which men do not doubt. . . . Men have known for a very long time that it is easier to lift a heavy stone on the end of a lever than it is to raise it in the hands. . . . And it does not sound sensible in such cases to say that our statement regarding the raising of the stone is not *really true,* but is only a *convenient way* of *expressing something.*"

The great flaw we have noticed in the pragmatic conception of truth is its failure to distinguish clearly between the two parallel growths of ideas—absolutely true ideas and provisionally true ideas. It will not be fruitless to examine the reasons that have led Pragmatists to reject the copy-of-reality definition of truth, and to substitute in its place the broad, loose agreement mentioned above. Two seem most probable. First, the Pragmatist does not understand in what sense the intellectualists use the term "copy of reality." "I have honestly tried to stretch my imagination," says James, "and to read the best possible meaning into the rationalist view, but I have to confess that it still completely baffles me."[27] "The popular notion is that a true idea must copy its reality. Shut your eyes and think

[26] "Essays, Philosophical and Psychological," Longmans, Green & Co., 1908.

[27] P. 234.

of yonder clock on the wall, and you get just such a true picture or copy of its dial. But your idea of its works is much less a copy, yet it passes muster and in no way clashes with the reality."[28] "Where our ideas cannot copy definitely their object, what does agreement with that object mean?"[29]

Now, when intellectualists say that the mind must copy reality, they do not maintain, as James seems to insinuate, that there is a quasi photographic, line for line copy of the object in the intellect. That never takes place, and finding it just as hard as Professor James to conceive such an agreement, with him we repudiate it. What, then, does "copy of reality" mean for us? James certainly admits that our ideas represent reality in some way. Now what does that phrase "to represent reality" mean? It means merely this —that we *know* the object *as it is*. Let us apply this to an idea which James would find it hard to conceive as copying an object—heroism. What is heroism? Certainly heroism is not a thing my eye can picture, though I have seen many a brave man. Just as certainly it is something which my imagination can fashion no image of, though in imagination I may clothe my hero with a wealth of brave deeds no living hero has possessed. And yet just as certain and evident it is to me that I *know* what a hero is. And I know what a hero is because I know what *heroism* is. And just as certainly as there is a hero, so, too, there is something in him which makes him what he is, just as in the coward that something is lacking. Heroism is not the heroic act, nor is want of heroism the lack of the act, else when not in action the hero and the coward would be the same. Therefore, there is something in the hero, a quality, the source of his heroic actions, which waits but for the opportunity to show itself—that something is *heroism,* and it is just as real in him and just as much a motive power as the mysterious electricity that courses through the wires and moves with ceaseless motion the wheels of a mighty engine. What, then, is heroism? Perhaps I may not be able to realize it or express it in all its fullness, but certainly I can express some of its essential attributes. It is that quality which moves a man to suffer unflinchingly, uncomplainingly in a worthy cause trials that would break a coward; it is that quality which makes a man, when his country has need of him, leave home and friend and fortune and sacrifice his life that his fellowmen may live. So when my idea represents such a quality I *know* what heroism *is*—my idea has *copied reality*—the object *is* as I *know* it to be. Let it be remembered we are not now going into particulars as to the distinction that exists between different ideas.

[28] P. 199.
[29] P. 199.

There are some that represent sensible objects, there are some that represent immaterial qualities, there are some that touch the world of spirit, and, rising above the finite order, there are some that represent God Himself. Varying as they do in many other respects, this they have in common—in all the intellect knows what the object is.

This knowledge may not be exhaustive, adequate, complete, but that is not the point at issue. To agree with an object my idea must not represent all that is in the object—that is impossible to the human idea—but if it be true it does represent the object according to some of its phases, some of its attributes, and so far it is in agreement with the object; nor will any further knowledge destroy this agreement. And this is so true that, to return to our idea of heroism, once having known what heroism is, having derived this idea from reality, I may use it as a norm or rule with which to measure future heroes—if they agree with it, then I know that they *are* heroes; if not, then I know that they are *not heroes*. Now, an idea which is so in agreement with reality that it may be used to test future reality to find if *it* be in agreement with past reality experienced, may in a very true and clear sense be said to copy reality, though in no sense of the word is it a quasi photographic line for line representation of it. This is what we understand by copying reality, by copying it so that there is an immutable agreement with it; for my idea of heroism, if it be true, will never change. This is the intellectualist's position, and we find it just as easy to understand what such a "copy" means as to understand what the broad, loose agreement of the Pragmatists means.

The second reason for the difficulty of the Pragmatists is seemingly apparent. Pragmatism observes that our knowledge is in constant mutation; we learn some fact, and with our idea of it plunge again into the stream of experience to learn other facts, all this subsequent knowledge being grafted on previous knowledge, modifying it and changing its aspect. If, however, truth is a mere copy of reality, a mere static relation between mind and object, how can knowledge be in mutation? An object once known is known forever; the idea is a copy of reality, an eternally unchangeable copy. How, then, can truth and knowledge grow? James says: "The great assumption of the Intellectualists is that truth means essentially an inert, static relation. When you've got your true idea of anything, there's an end of the matter. You're in possession, you know; you have fulfilled your thinking destiny." Since experience teaches us that knowledge does grow, it follows that our ideas are constantly growing, and changing, and modifying. Truth, then, changes, hence cannot stand in absolute agreement with reality.

But since there must be some agreement, truth consists in provisional agreement, and thus we have a probable hypothesis why Pragmatism calls those provisional ideas true to which we would not deign to apply the name of truth. James admits he does not understand the intellectualist view of truth. For him, on this point, the old school is in intellectual bankruptcy; hence he arraigns and rejects its dogmas.

Let us for a moment examine the Intellectualist's position on this point. Let us see what their "static relation" of mind to the object means, and whether or not truth, according to their position, may not also be *dynamic* or *plastic*. And here we are speaking of truth in the strictest sense of the word, *"absolute truth,"* of truth according to the *intellectualist* definition. Is truth, then, static or at rest, as James says? First of all, we define truth as an equation of the mind with reality—that is, that the mind is the same in representation as the object is in being. To make itself like to an object the mind does not have to be similar to the object it represents in all the qualities that the object possesses in itself; *i. e.,* it does not have to be an all perfect copy of the object. It is sufficient if it be similar to the object in that quality or those qualities which it intends to express, and with regard to them its condition is static or at rest. For, given this relation, given this copy of reality, that truth remains eternally and absolutely the same. But in saying this one says nothing in contradiction to the *growth* and *plasticity* of truth; for *truth* can *grow* and *truth* is *plastic*. Truth *cannot* grow with regard to the precise aspect first apprehended in an object; there it is static. But with an idea of the object thus conceived as a guide, one can dive again into experience and learn new aspects of the same object. For example, an apple may be apprehended as a *colored thing*. This static relation of the mind to the apple as a colored thing does not change. But, knowing this much about an apple, one can enter experience again and gather other facts, apprehend the apple under other aspects of taste, form, etc. Hence one's knowledge of the apple grows to fullness not by a change in the knowledge of any of its parts, but by summing up into a whole the results of these partial cognitions.

Again, if one looks at the objects of one's knowledge, not *absolutely,* but according to the relations which they bear to other objects known or to be known, it is evident that truth with regard to a reality may grow indefinitely. For as daily experience adds its quota of facts and brings before one's mind other objects not known before, the first known object may assume relations with regard to these new objects. This is also an explanation of that phenomenon which troubles James so much. Why are we constantly turning

back on previous knowledge to readjust and modify it under the inrush of new and daily facts? Why does truth seem to change? Because the old knowledge appears to change, and does so not *formally, i. e.,* as regards its equation with its objects under the aspects already known, but because of the new relations which the objects, under those known aspects, assume to other objects. To illustrate, let us take again our apple. My first knowledge of an apple may be merely that of a "colored thing." This always remains true; an apple is always a "colored thing," and the equation between my mind and the "colored thing," once made, is true forever. I can now begin to learn other qualities of the apple. It may be apprehended under the quality of sweetness and roundness, etc. Again, one has a knowledge of other fruits, and so the apple assumes various relations to these. It is either like them or unlike them. Then one learns of the essence of the apple and its mode of propagation. Finally, one's last full knowledge appears very different from the knowledge first begun with. It has changed. The stock of truth and consequently my knowledge has grown. And yet the first knowledge of the apple as a "colored thing" has not become false, but still remains true. It is plain, then, how truth can and does grow, while it still holds the attribute of eternal. Thus we maintain firmly that the *absolute correspondence* with *reality view* of truth is not in contradiction with the growth of knowledge. Truth is *static* and truth is *plastic* while it remains *eternal.*

Enough has been advanced, I think, to show that the pragmatic concept of truth is wanting in actual cash value. It is advanced to save philosophy from the intellectual bankruptcy in which it is *supposed* to have fallen because of the intellectualist's doctrine on truth. The bankruptcy, however, is not on the side of the intellectualists. Pragmatism begins by founding its truth on a misconception, and ends by making it subjective and altogether mutable. Thus we have subjectivism, and following upon it skepticism. There will be as many truths as individuals, even though each individual's truth openly contradicts that of his neighbor. Each individual, then, will be his own law, with moral ruin as the result. Truly, then, right philosophy. It is substantially the old fallacy of Protagoras, from newness for its idea of truth. It is, however, almost as old as philosophy. It is substantially the old fallacy of Protagnas, from which came the era of sophistry in Greek philosophy. It is a fallacy exploded long ago by the intellectual keenness of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. Now we are asked to accept this exploded belief under a modern dress and put back the progress of the intellectual world two thousand years by returning to the days of Grecian sophistry and skepticism. But against this danger stands, as a

strong wall, the common belief of men, founded on fact, which holds as tenaciously now as it has ever done in the past, to the idea of an immutable and eternal truth.

II.—ITS CONCEPT OF REALITY.

From the dawn of man's intellectual life one psychological fact common to all stands out in bold relief, in importance towering above and overshadowing all others; it is the consciousness of a sum of realities which seem to exist outside of and apart from us. This constant psychological experience must be taken into account and interpreted by every system of philosophy which aims at solving the "riddle of life;" it is the question of explaining our sensations, or, as modern parlance has it, the question of the resisting factor in our experience. Professor James puts it this way: "Reality in general is what our truths have to take account of, and the first part of reality from this point of view is the flux of our sensations. Sensations are forced upon us, coming we know not whence. Over their nature, order and quantity we have as good as no control."[30]

The problem of philosophy, then, is to explain the meaning of man's consciousness of a great universe, the cosmos as it is called, the sum of realities amongst which he moves and has his being, which confront him at every step and challenge recognition and which are closely interwoven with his very existence. What is this reality of which man has so vivid a consciousness? Is it really something outside of and apart from him or is this consciousness but the unfolding of his mind in idle dreams or perhaps the result of God's operations on the human intellect?

The themes that attempt to solve our problem, as far as they touch us, may be reduced to three—the idealistic theory, the realistic theory and the pragmatic theory as endeavoring to mediate between the two. Idealism has taken many shapes and has hung about the skirts of philosophy ever since the days of Plato. In general idealists are those philosophers who deny or call in question the existence of bodies outside of us, *i. e.*, they challenge the objectivity of our perceptions and deny that our sensations represent anything objectively real, existing independent of us. There are two kinds of such idealism—subjective and objective. Both kinds agree in declaring our sensations to be mere subjective modifications, devoid of all objective reality. Both admit the principle of causality and are thus bound to offer a sufficient explanation of these phenomena. This the subjective idealists do by assertings that sensations are the mere product of our psychic activity. Objective idealists, however, assign

[30] "Pragmatism," p. 244.

an external cause to them and declare that it is God that produces them in our minds. Idealism, at least modern idealism, took its rise in the errors of Descartes, and culminated in its greatest absurdity the egoism of Hegel. With it are identified in one way or another such names as Berkeley, Malefranche, Geoberti, Kant, Fichte and Schelling.

Directly opposed and contradicting this view of the universe and the nature of our sensations is the realistic and scholastic theory. It tells us that the universe is a sum of realities apart and separate from our knowledge of them, and hence that even if never known, such objects would be truly existent and real. Our minds are mirrors that reflect the realities outside of us and bring us into close connection with them. "Since all knowledge comes to us by way of the senses, we must perforce take the reports of our senses as true so far as they go, not merely as regards the fact of sensation, which is, of course, unquestionable, but also as regards the external objects of which our senses appear to give evidence. . . . But it should be carefully noted that in this view the external world does not and can never appeal only to the senses. Along with every sense impression and set of impressions there arises inevitably an intellectual process. In all our experience of the external world we are conscious not merely of sensible qualities perceived in objects, but also of the substance or underlying and permanent reality which is naturally and spontaneously conceived by the mind as distinguishable from the qualities or accidents which are more or less valuable."[31]

We also abstract from the individuating notes and perceive the nature of the object which can be multiplied in many individuals of the same class. Thus substance and nature, rationality and animality are intellectual conceptions. "Though indicated by sensation they are not themselves sensible, and thus the reality of existence has what may be called an ideal side."[32]

"The mind, working upon, arranging and rearranging the details of the pictures presented to it, not only apprehends truly the essence of external objects, but also infers correctly the laws or principles which govern their existence and determine their mutual relations. It follows that even the most abstract notions have a real foundation in sensible objects, and discovery and invention are but the *perception* of the true nature and relations of those objects."[33]

According to this view, then, the sum of realities outside of us is absolute, complete and independent. Realities are mirrored in our intellectual life, but the mere fact of our knowing them induces no

[31] "Spectrum of Truth," pp. 14 and 15.
[32] "Spectrum," p. 15.
[33] "Spectrum," p. 16.

intrinsic change in them. They do not need to be known, and our knowing them leaves them as they were before. In other words, there is, what Schiller denies, "an objective world given independently of us and constraining us to recognize it."[34] Attempting to mediate between these opposing theories comes the pragmatic explanation. Pragmatism admits that there is some objectivity to our cognitions, some reality outside of them, but what that reality is and how far our ideas represent it is irrelevant. As Schiller says in his essay on "Personal Idealism:" "The world is sssentially what we make it. It is fruitless to define it by what it originally was or by what it is apart from us; it *is* what is made of it. Hence . . . the world is plastic."[35] Pragmatism, then, admits the resisting factor in experience, but in order to explain it revives the Aristotelian and scholastic concept of prime matter as material that that is to be determined by a specific form, mere potentiality really to receive this or that determination as the case may be. In other words, our sensations offer us the raw material, out of which we construct the universe. "A sensation," says James, "is rather like a client who has given his case to a lawyer and then has passively to listen in the court room to whatever account of his affairs, pleasant or unpleasant, the lawyer finds it most expedient to give."[36] Again: "We receive, in short, the block of marble; we carve the statue ourselves."[37]

Sensations, according to the Pragmatists, flow on uninterruptedly, and from them we choose out one fact here, another there, shift them, rearrange them in the light of our previous knowledge, adapt them to please ourselves and thus form what Schiller calls true or secondary reality. "Hence," says James, "even in the field of sensation our minds exert a certain arbitrary choice. By our inclusions and omissions we trace the field's extent; by an emphasis we mark its foreground and its background; by our order we read it in this direction or in that."[38]

What Mr. Schiller calls primary reality, out of which secondary or real reality is to be made, is the mere flux of our sensations, meaningless in themselves, until we have begun subjectively to operate upon them, to discriminate and rearrange them, to put on them subjective forms. The mere flux of sensation or primary reality is, then, mere potentiality waiting for its determinations, crude marble expectant of the sculptor's hands, the passive client waiting for "whatever account of his affairs, pleasant or un-

[34] "Axioms and Postulates," p. 59.
[35] "Personal Idealism," p. 60.
[36] "Pragmatism," p. 246.
[37] "Pragmatism," p. 247.
[38] "Pragmatism," p. 247.

pleasant, the lawyer finds it most expedient to give." "In short," says Schiller, "at the level of primary reality, conceived as purely cognitive, everything would be and remain in an undiscriminated flow. . . . A merely intellectual spectator would have no reason for selecting some things as more real and important than others. . . . But the mind is not of such a nature as to put up with this . . . situation. It is interested, and purposive, and desirous of operating on and controlling its primary reality. And so it proceeds to discriminate, to distinguish between 'appearance' and 'reality,' between 'primary' and 'real reality,' to accept what appears with mental reservations and provisionally to operate upon it, and to alter it."[39]

The *real reality,* then, of the Pragmatists is an end to be achieved; it is not something already given which is to be copied by our minds; it is that which is the result of subjective operations on the sensations we experience. That which affects us through the instrumentality of these sensations is called by Schiller primary reality, but it scarcely merits that name, since it is the mere potentiality of the secondary and real reality to be built up by our cognitive efforts. James says: "When we talk of reality independent of human thinking, then it seems a thing very hard to find. It reduces to the notion of what is just entering into experience and yet to be named or else to serve aboriginal presence in experience before any belief about the mensense had arisen, before any human conception had been applied. It is what is absolutely dumb and evanescent, the merely ideal limit of our mind. We may glimpse it, but we never grasp it; what we grasp is always some substitute for it which previous human thinking has peptonized and cooked for our consumption."[40]

In other words, sensations or the facts of experience do not speak for themselves; they are unmeaning until we interpret them. This we do by our ideas. Our ideas, however, do not represent the facts or realities of experience as they may be in themselves. About this point we know nothing; our ideas merely attach a predicate to this fact of sensation, which predicate does not necessarily represent a quality in the fact, but my subjective thought about it. One interprets the facts of experience in the light of his past experiences; he looks upon them in the way most expedient to him and makes them fit in with all his past ideas. James says: "Only the recentest fraction of reality . . . comes to us without the human touch, and that fraction has to become humanized in the sense of being squared with the mass already there."[41] "In all these cases we

[39] "Studies," p. 221.
[40] "Pragmatism," p. 249.
[41] "Pragmatism," p. 248.

humanly make an addition to some sensible reality, and that reality tolerates the addition."[42]

The pragmatic concept, then, is that the universe is a human work; the sum of realities as we know them is man made. It is true that the senses have offered us the facts, but we have shuffled and arranged them at our will; experience is shot through and through with the human element. Therefore the flow of experience, the external appearance does not make a thing real, but its acceptance by me. Whether there is a reality apart and independent from us which in itself is as it is represented by our sensations we do not know, and it is a question irrelevant to ask. As Professor Bawden, of the University of Cincinnati, put it, writing in the *Popular Science Monthly* for July, 1908: "We find ourselves in mid-stream of the Niagara of experience and may define what it is only by working back and forth within the current. 'We don't know where we're going, but we're on the way.' If it be asked, where does this 'concrete' experience come from? the question, as Professor Dewey replies, is irrelevant. Experience does not 'come from' anywhere. It is here. We begin with it as reality here and now. To pursue the question of the origin of experience in an absolute sense is to seek to run out on an abstraction as if it were a tight-rope, when it has no support at the other end. 'How experience became we shall never find out,' writes Professor Dewey, 'for the reason that experience always is. We shall never account for it by referring it to something else, for 'something else' is only for and in experience.' "[43]

Our intellectual processes, therefore, according to Pragmatists, are no longer mirrors held up to nature to represent that which has existence apart from us. It is true they are in a certain way mirrors; all the elements of the image have been given by sensations, but the image that is formed is not a copy of a previous existing reality, but a distorted or, as Pragmatists would say, a bettered rearrangement of the elements furnished by experience. No longer is there an independent reality and universe calling upon human intellects to copy it. Absolute reality has no existence save as the ideal goal of our cognitive acts; it is that towards which we tend by all this forming and unforming and counter-forming of our ideas about the universe. Absolute reality is a term to be produced; that reality will be absolute with which all men will be satisfied and no one will be tempted to change by further intellectual efforts.

Thus is utterly overthrown the wall between the two great orders, the ontological and the logical. Realists demand *these* two orders, viz., the ontological order, the order of existences, separate and dis-

[42] *Opus cit*, p. 252.

[43] *Popular Science Monthly*, July, 1908, p. 70.

tinct from the thinking mind and the logical order, or that of the thinking mind which is to represent the realities of the ontological order and give them ideal existence. There is no room for these two orders in the pragmatic theory. There is one order, the ontological or the logical as you choose to call it, according as it is looked at under different aspects. As Professor Bawden says in the article already cited: "This empirical point of view has several important implications. It implies, for one thing, that the distinction between experience and reality is not an absolute one, not an ontological distinction, as the metaphysicians say, but only a methodological or functional one. . . . Experience regarded from the point of view of what it is, its content, its filling of objects and events, we call reality. Reality, regarded from the point of view of how it goes on, or the way in which it occurs in consciousness, that is, viewed as a process of evolution here and now, we call experience."[44] Thus reality is what it is known or experienced to be. There is no independent reality as far as we are concerned. The facts of experience offered by sensations and our ideas formed to explain them are but elements of the one reality. *Fact* is not reality, *idea* is not reality, but *idea* explaining *fact* is reality. Our present knowledge representing a universe of this or that mould is the only reality Pragmatists know or care to speak about. As James says: "The import of the difference between Pragmatism and rationalism is now in sight throughout its whole extent. The essential contrast is that for rationalism reality is ready made and complete from all eternity, while for Pragmatism it is still in the making and awaits part of its complexion from the future."[45]

The Pragmatists by confounding the ontological and logical orders have fallen into that subjectivism and idealism which they were so anxious to avoid. In vain Pragmatists seek to extricate themselves from this position. Only recently in the *Journal of Philosophy* for December 3, 1908, Professor James, in behalf of himself and Schiller, sought to reject the imputation of subjectivism of which he has been convicted by M. Hebert, the French philosopher. He says: "Anticipating the results of the general truth processes of mankind, I begin with the abstract notion of a reality." But what do these words show except that by this utterance Professor James has openly contradicted a position which we have demonstrated to be his and Schiller's, and which is proven by the obvious meaning of their words and the interpretations of honest critics? What do these words mean except that Pragmatists are beginning to realize the untenableness of their position? These words do not prove our

[44] *Popular Science Monthly*, July, 1908, p. 65.
[45] "Pragmatism," p. 257.

analysis wrong, but only what is patent to the most superficial student—the contradictions of Pragmatism. If we are to take these last words of James as indicative of the pragmatic position, then wherein lies the boasted difference on the question of reality between Realism and Pragmatism?

According to Pragmatists, then, reality is made by sognitive processes, and since our knowledge is constantly on the increase, so is our reality. Since, as the Pragmatists conceive it, one can manipulate his knowledge and make some things true and other things false, so he can manipulate reality, making some realities and unmaking others. Pragmatists grow positively exultant over the added dignity this power gives to man; no longer is he a mere idle spectator of a grand universe; he becomes an active operator in it and assumes the rôle and dignity of a *quasi* creator. This is especially inspiring to Signor Papini, an Italian Pragmatist, who with true Italian fervor, in the words of James, "grows fairly dithyrambic over the view that it opens of man's divinely creative functions."[46] The thought, too, is a stimulating one for Schiller. He says: "Our actual experience contains literally infinite possibilities of alternate universes, which struggle for existence in the minds of every agent who is capable of choosing between alternatives. Thus it is our duty and our privilege to coöperate in the shaping of the world; among infinite possibilities to select and realize the best."[47]

Two things will at first sight strike you as inconsistent in the pragmatic explanation. First, if it is each man's work to construct his own universe out of the raw material furnished by sensations, how is it that for all of us, in some respects, the universe has a certain rigid sameness? Why do we all think the same way about certain facts of experience, especially with regard to the most ordinary features of the sensible, external world? I suppose a Pragmatist would answer this difficulty by pointing to his doctrine on objective truth. All truths, according to him, are in the beginning subjective. If now I can get other men to believe as I believe with regard to some point, my subjective truth begins to assume objectivity as existing in the minds of others. As Schiller says: "The power of constituting objective truth is not granted so easily. Society exercises almost as severe a control over the intellectual as over the moral eccentricities of its members; indeed, it often so organizes itself as to render the recognition of new truth nearly impossible."[48] Let us apply this to the question, how is it that all men look upon certain things in the same way? This consistency

[46] "Pragmatism," p. 257.
[47] "Studies," p. 219.
[48] "Studies," p. 153.

and sameness of thought which we observe is merely the acceptance by all men of our ancestors' subjective beliefs. Some one of our remote ancestors thinks this way about the facts of experience, thus making reality for himself; he wins others to his point of view, and thus his reality becomes a reality also for his neighbor. When many or all men have accepted this subjective belief of one man, we have objective truth, and the attitude of all men's minds towards certain experiences becomes the same. As James puts it: "Our fundamental ways of thinking about things are discoveries of exceedingly remote ancestors which have been able to preserve themselves throughout the experience of all subsequent time. They form one great stage of equilibrium in the human mind's development—the stage of common sense. Other stages have grafted themselves upon this stage, but have never succeeded in displacing it."[49]

A second objection that comes spontaneously from the first insight into the pragmatic position is this: After all, you Pragmatists are making all this stir about nothing. Where is any newness or originality in your concept? Are you not offering us mere Kantianism, with, perhaps, a slight modification here and there? Kant, too, admitted some objectivity to our ideas, *i. e.*, he granted that the senses supplied the phenomena, the external appearance which was to be operated upon by the thinking subject, or, better, coördinated according to certain a priori subjective forms or categories. Thus space and time and quality and quantity, and so with the rest are not objectively in the realities presented by the senses, but are only additions of our minds; hence, in a true sense, following Kant's view, we build up and make our own universe.

This so patent objection, however, has not escaped the Pragmatists, and they answer in the words of James: "Superficially this sounds like Kant's view, but between categories fulminated before nature began and categories gradually forming themselves in nature's presence, the whole chasm between rationalism and empiricism yawns. To the genuine 'Kantianer' Schiller will always be to Kant as a Satyr to Hyperion."[50] To translate, Kant's forms were a priori a very part of our nature, an inborn necessity of arranging all our perceptions according to prescribed categories; the pragmatic forms are not a priori, not a necessity of nature; they could have been otherwise if we and our ancestors had chosen it to be so; the universe is as we know it not because of any constraining influence necessarily leading men thus to know it, but because to-day's knowledge of the universe freely took its present shape.

And now for our refutation of all this. First, then, what have

[49] "Pragmatism," p. 170.
[50] "Pragmatism," p. 249.

we to refute? We deny the statement of the Pragmatists that there is not a complete and absolute sum of realities apart and distinct from us, whose existence is altogether independent of our cognitive processes, to represent which is the object of our intellectual operations and in which no mere knowing on the part of the subject thinking induces any intrinsic change. We say that the order of such realities is the ontological, distinct from the logical order or that of the subject thinking; that the thinking subject, by representing the objects of the ontological order, does not make reality, but finds it, discovers only what was already preëxistent. We assert that predicates, applied by us to objects of the ontological order, are not mere subjective ways of thinking about them, but represent a corresponding quality in the objects; that these predicates are not applied according to a subjective whim, but because of a quality in the object calling upon us for and demanding such a predicate. As a confirmation we affirm that objects of experience to which have been applied predicates falsely, that is, which have no objective qualities corresponding to these predicates, will by their subsequent actions resist such a predicate. Finally, we hold that absolute substantial reality is not a term to be produced by intellectual processes, but exists separate and independent of them, and that our knowledge rathers depends on the existence of such realities than their existence on our knowledge.

If we applied the pragmatic test of that which works to our position on reality, we should find it proved without a doubt. For men in general spontaneously fall into our way of looking at things, and scientists are forced to embrace it as a fundamental necessity for getting to work at all. Professor James himself says: "It may be that the truest of all beliefs shall be that in trans-subjective realities. It certainly *seems* truest, for no rival belief is as voluminously satisfactory."[51]

However, we do not admit as final nor care to use the pragmatic norm. Besides our aim is rather to prove the falsity of the pragmatic concept than the truth of our own. The first, most obvious and easiest refutation, then, of our adversaries' assumption is that which comes from disproving the pragmatic doctrine on the nature of truth and the idea. It is by true ideas that we assimilate to ourselves and acquire knowledge of reality. If, then, one wholly misconceives the nature and function of an idea he will hopelessly confuse his notion of reality. A right idea of reality without a right idea of truth is a contradiction in terms. Let us briefly examine how their false notions with regard to truth and the nature of the idea are responsible for the position which Pragmatists hold con-

[51] *Journal of Philosophy*, December 3, 1908.

cerning reality. Pragmatists claim that the only value of an idea is a functional or instrumental one. Of course, we are not speaking of ideas in the sense of mere simple apprehensions, but in the broader sense which includes concepts formed from judgments. Pragmatically, then, the office of an idea is not primarily to copy reality; it is only an instrument for combining various portions of experience to make them run smoothly. To be concrete, suppose that one has for a long time been convinced that the theory of matter and form explains the ultimate condition of matter. In the course of time one learns, by chemical investigations, the laws of definite and multiple proportions and sees that from these is consistently deduced the atomic theory of matter. Our philosopher finds himself in a dilemma. Two rival theories, both founded on fact, are struggling in his mind for acceptance. As a Pragmatist he will first try to make these two theories agree or at least not to contradict one another. So he first tries to explain the laws of multiple and definite proportions so as to make them fit in with the hylomorphis theory. If this cannot be, he will try so to moderate his first theory that while retaining its essential features he may be able to admit as much as is necessary of the atomic theory. This he might do by accepting the Neo-Scholastic theory of matter and form, saying that the atom is the lost particle of complete matter in the physical world, but then this atom is composed of prime or indeterminate matter and a substantial form. Thus our philosopher has hit upon an idea that reconciles two different and at first sight apparently contradictory portions of his experience. In this illustration we see the nature of the idea as explained by Pragmatists; it is an instrument for uniting different portions of experience; it is a smoother over of transitions, wedding old experience to new fact with a minimum of jolt and a maximum of continuity. To be true it isn't necessary that this idea represent objective reality as it is in itself, that *de facto,* outside of me, the last portion of matter be an atom and that this be made up of matter and form. The only requisite to make this idea true is that it should work in explaining experience; that it should be helpful mentally, and that in explaining facts through it one should not be led into any intellectual inconsistency. "It is," as James says, "*as if* reality were made of ether, atoms or elections, but we mustn't think so literally."

This, then, is an explanation of the famous functional or instrumental nature of the idea—an idea is true as long as it works in explaining experience; in its failure to make good in this office it becomes false. If this position is correct, then, if an idea is not primarily a copy of reality, if an idea is only an hypothesis by which we seek to make all our diverse experiences so agree that the experi-

ence of to-day will not contradict yesterday's content of experience, it is plain that we know nothing about the objects outside of us, which were the causes of those experiences. Our idea about reality is all the reality we have, or, in other words, reality *is* as it is known to be. This subjective hypothesis about sensations received is our only reality; any other reality is neither known nor is a subject relevant to us.

This is not the place to refute the pragmatic concept on truth and the idea. This we have done elsewhere. Their position has been attacked and disproved by able philosophers within and without the Church. Indeed, in the recent philosophical conference at Heidelberg the German philosophers were especially wroth that such a doctrine could prevail. With regard to these instrumental ideas we find no difficulty in admitting them; we do not, however, call them true ideas because they work, but hypotheses, whose usefulness is proportioned to their workableness. The name "true ideas" we reserve for such as copy reality, which therefore when they are once true, remain so forever. It is evident that from the falsity of the pragmatic position on truth we must reject their explanation of reality.

But leaving aside this strongest argument, must not the Pragmatists logically admit a reality apart from us and very relevant to us, which is not the result of any mere knowing on the part of the subject thinking? Pragmatists admit the stubborn flux of our sensations, over whose order and number we have no control. Rejecting idealism, as they do, they must admit that these sensations come from objects outside of us necessarily affecting us in a certain way. If these objects necessarily affect us in a certain way, it must needs be because they possess certain qualities which act upon our organs in different ways and produce different sensations—sensations of blueness and greenness, of extension, sweetness, hardness, etc. Thus far, I think, the Pragmatists would agree. But they would add in reply: "Yes, but these qualities expressed in sensations do not determine what we think about objects which contain them." They would point to their distinction of primary and secondary reality, primary reality being the mere flux of our sensations, secondary reality what we say about such sensations. "Even though the objects have such qualities," a Pragmatist would say, "what I think about those objects depends upon myself." James says pertinent to this point: "Take our sensations. *That* they are is undoubtedly beyond our control, but *which* we attend to, note and make emphatic in our conclusions, depends on our own interests; and according as we lay emphasis here or there quite different formulations of truth result. We reach the same facts differently. Waterloo with

the same fixed details spells a victory for an Englishman; for a Frenchman it spells defeat."[52] Again he says: "We break the flux of sensible reality into things at our will. We create the subjects of our true as well as of our false propositions. We create the predicates also. . . . Cæsar crossed the Rubicon and was a menace to Rome's freedom. He is also an American school room pest, made into one by the reaction of our schoolboys on his writings. . . . You see how naturally one comes to the humanistic principle. You can't weed out the human contribution. Our nouns and adjectives are all humanized heirlooms, and in the theories we build them into, the inner order and arrangement is wholly dictated by human contributions, intellectual consistency being one of them."[53] "We add both to the subject and predicate part of reality. The world stands really malleable, waiting to receive its final touches at our hands. Like the kingdom of heaven, it suffers human violence willingly. Man engenders truths upon it."[54]

Schiller says on this point: "We supplement the inadequacies of our actual experience by assumed realities whose reality is assured to us by their value." But it would be useless to multiply quotations further. The idea is plain. Pragmatism claims for man full fling over his sensations; man impresses on sensations whatever form he wishes. This we flatly deny. No predicate is rightly applied by us to an object which has not a corresponding quality in that object, and that quality is antecedent is the reason why we apply such a predicate. Surely a man of James' intellectual perception can see that the reason why Waterloo spells victory to an Englishman and to a Frenchman defeat is not altogether due to a subjective way of thinking, but because of a quality in the object. Waterloo objectively was both a victory and a defeat. Objectively, too, Cæsar is both a menace to Rome's freedom and an American boy's school room pest. It is true we interpret facts in the light of past experience and present conditions, but always such interpretations are founded on the presence of corresponding qualities in the object. Hence the Pragmatists are convicted out of their own mouths, taking what they admit they can be logically constrained to concede a sum of realities apart and distinct from us, which is merely represented by our sensations. Or, if they wish to be impaled on the other horn of the dilemma, they are forced back upon idealism.

It is plain, then, that we do not make our universe; we only represent by our sensations and ideas realities already existing; we do not attach predicates at will to the objects of experience, or make

---

[52] "Pragmatism," p. 246.
[53] *Opus cit*, p. 254.
[54] *Opus cit*, p. 257.

reality as the Pragmatists would have it. And yet there is a half truth in that phrase, "making reality." The Pragmatists, however, have made it a whole truth. It is with the Pragmatists as it is with the Modernists. Catholic philosophy for a long time knew that God was immanent in all things; she knew besides that He was transcendent over all things; that He was separate and distinct from all things. Modernists took the half truth and closed their eyes to the whole truth. God is in all things, they argued; then all things are emanations of God, and pantheism alone solves *truly* life's riddle. Thus it is with Pragmatists. They, too, have a half truth which Catholic philosophy has always recognized. Let us see. Although there are many realities existing apart and separate from us, they do not become real to us until we know them. Many chemical realities existed before we studied chemistry; they became real to us when we had acquired a knowledge of that branch. Thus there can be a growth in subjective reality, that is, as my knowledge of things grows, the sum of things I know grows larger and more things become real to me. But can I make reality? In one sense, yes; for the realities I know are dependent in great measure on my different purposes in life. Let us take the example of a scholar who determines to study chemistry; it is due to that purpose that chemical realities become real to *him.* Thus he makes many realities *for himself* which are not real *for another* who does not know them. By studying astronomy a man will make a whole sum of realities *for himself* that will change his whole aspect of the universe, not that he makes these realities *in themselves,* but because his purpose to study astronomy is the cause of many objects becoming real *to him.*

Besides, every thought, every action of ours is a reality; not a substantial reality, it is true, but an accidental one, one that is distinct from its subject, yet dependent upon it. By every thought and action we are changed, we are not as we were before; we have made reality, but, then, only accidental reality.

Finally, it is true within certain limits that we can work on the world of physical reality and make it more suitable to our needs. Since the world's perfection is a relative one, relative to its power of aiding man, we can make it more perfect, more suited to meet the demands made upon it. We can combine elemental substances to make them more serviceable to us; we can draw oxygen and hydrogen from water; we can produce gas and oils and numerous by-products from the destructive distillation of coal. We do not create one particle of matter or one quality or force in matter; we juxtapose, we combine, we separate what is offered us, and the results that follow are according to certain laws inherent in matter. We cannot create a single grain of dust or annihilate it; we cannot create the

smallest fraction of energy or destroy it. 'Tis true we can change and order the elements which nature bounteously offers us, yet even here we cannot do with nature absolutely what we will. Our makings and unmakings of reality are according to fixed laws which we discover, but do not decree. Some elements we are powerless to unite; some unite, but only in fixed proportions or under certain rigid conditions; over some we have as good as no control. What does all this show, except that outside of us there exists a wondrous universe of realities subject to our control, but at the same time resisting it, allowing us to manipulate them, but always along certain lines, the laws of which are within their own natures and independent of us?

It is pleasant for lovers of Catholic philosophy to contemplate in her doctrine on reality another victory over those who do not own her sway. In her concept of reality she has all the advantages of the rival teachings and none of their flaws. By her teaching on universals she admits a certain idealism without becoming subjective and unreal; by her admission of a reality plastic along certain lines she contains the so-called inspiring tenets of pragmatism without falling into its absurd contradictions and logical impossibilities. Always moderate, always offering the most rational and common-sense explanation of the great problems that agitate the minds of men, Catholic philosophy is beautiful because she is true, and may we not say she is true because the Divine Hand of Eternal Truth is guiding her, that she may the better defend the sublime revelations nestling in the bosom of Catholic theology?

Ignatius W. Cox, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

Book Reviews

A Thesaurus Dictionary of the English Language. Designed to suggest immediately any desired word needed to express exactly a given idea. A dictionary, synonyms, antonyms, idioms, foreign phrases, pronunciations. A copious correlation of words. Prepared under the supervision of Francis Andrew March, LL. D., L. H. D., D. C. L., Litt. D., and Francis Andrew March, Jr., A. M., Ph. D. Quarto, pp. about 1,300, with marginal index. Philadelphia: Historical Publishing Company.

Our use of a "Thesaurus of the English Language" is comparatively modern. In London in 1852 appeared a volume entitled "Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases, Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and Assist in Literary Composition," by Peter Mark Roget, M. D., F. R. S. It was intended to supply a collection of words and idiomatic combinations of the English language, "arranged not in alphabetical order as they are in a dictionary, but according to the ideas which they express," so that any one who has an idea may here find the word or words by which it may be most fitly and aptly expressed. This book has been for half a century a familiar part of the machinery used by authors, preachers, lecturers and professional men generally.

It was an excellent book, but it has gone out of date. The reading public, and especially the student body, has increased so enormously, and the English language has changed so extensively, that a new thesaurus is an urgent necessity. The first shortcoming in Roget is that there are no definitions of the words or explanations of the phrases. The book is really an index of words to be looked up in dictionaries and cyclopedias, unless one comes to it with his mind thoroughly stored with words and meanings.

Roget's arrangement is primarily one of nameable objects "It is impossible we should thoroughly understand the nature of the signs unless we first properly consider and arrange the *things* signified," is his motto, taken from Horne Tooke's "Diversions of Purley." He classifies nameables, after the manner of the English psychologists, into matter, mind (intellect, volition, affections), space and abstract relations, and divides and sub-divides these until he makes out an even thousand divisions, and into these he puts all the words. In order to find any word it was necessary to think out in which sub-division its idea belongs. This is worse than Ettmüller. It was necessary to add a verbal index, alphabetically arranged, with references to the groups by number. It is not easy, indeed, to find a word after you know the number of its group, for the group may contain a hundred words in no manageable order.

The machinery of a serviceable dictionary is found in the alphabet. The invention of alphabetic writing has been often pronounced the

most important ever made. It is not the least of its benefits to mankind that it affords the means of making knowledge accessible. Every one knows the letters of the alphabet. If all thoughts are arranged under their words, and the words arranged in alphabetic order, any one can find off-hand any of the million facts and thoughts which are stored in the dictionary. The use of simple alphabetic order is almost as important an invention as the representation of words by single signs of the elementary sounds.

The material of this thesaurus has been brought to alphabetic order. The publisher suggested that it be called a "Thesaurus Dictionary," believing that the word "thesaurus" will easily assume the meaning of *groups* and "dictionary" that of *alphabetic arrangement.* An example of its use brings out most clearly its usefulness. In using the Thesaurus Dictionary, look up any word connected with your subject in its alphabetic place in the vocabulary list in larger black type, exactly as in a common dictionary. Anger, for example, is found thus on page 45. It is there briefly defined as a violent passion, and two groups to which it belongs are then mentioned in small capitals—Excitability-Inexcitability and Favorite-Anger. To study the first group turn to Excitability-Inexcitability in its alphabetical place in the general vocabulary, page 372. There, under this heading, are two parallel columns, the left hand for Excitability, the right for Inexcitability, each running for a couple of pages and bringing together some one hundred and fifty words and phrases. They are divided into nouns, verbs, verbal phrases, adjectives, etc., arranged in alphabetic order. The first column contains all words and phrases naturally associated according to the laws of similarity, contiguity and comprehension, synonyms and the like; the second column contains a similar group related to the first column according to the law of contrast, antonyms, polar opposites and the like. By means of cross-references other groups of associated meaning are brought to the attention.

This illustration shows that the book is really a combination of dictionary and thesaurus, and its value can hardly be exaggerated. It contributes wonderfully to accuracy, nicety and clarity of expression, and it is indispensable for one who values these qualities in speaking and writing. In the appendix we find a study of our English speech, embracing its origin, history, roots and derivations, forms and relations, spellings and spelling reforms, etc.

SOME ASPECTS OF RABBINIC THEOLOGY. By *A. Schecter, M. A., Litt. D.* (Cantab.) 12mo., pp. 384. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1909. All rights reserved.

The contents of this book have grown out of a course of lectures

delivered at various learned centres and a series of essays published in the *Jewish Quarterly Review.* These essays began to appear in the year 1894. They attracted some notice and were utilized by several writers on theological subjects, both with and without due acknowledgment. They are now presented to the public in an expanded form, revised and corrected and increased by new chapters and other additional matter, amounting to about half the bulk of this volume.

It is not the author's purpose to write the history of Rabbinic theology, but rather to give some comprehensive view of a group of theological subjects as thought out and taught by the synagogue. Not a history of doctrine, but rather of the development of doctrine; a comparatively new field. The author says:

"This volume represents no philosophical exposition of the body of doctrine in the synagogue, nor does it offer a description of its system of ethics. Both the philosophy of the synagogue and its ethics have been treated in various works by competent scholars belonging to different schools of thought. The main aim of such works is, however, as it would seem, interpretation, more often re-interpretation. The object of the following pages is a different one. The task I set myself was to give a presentation of Rabbinic opinion on a number of theological topics as offered by Rabbinic literature, and forming an integral part of the religious consciousness of the bulk of the nation or 'Catholic Israel.'

"Keeping this end in view, I have considered it advisable not to intrude too much interpretation or paraphrase upon the rabbis. I let them have their own say in their own words, and even their own phraseology so far as the English idiom allowed. My work consisted in gathering the materials distributed all over the wide domain of Rabbinic literature, classifying, sifting and arranging them, and also in ascertaining clearly and stating in simple direct terms the doctrines and theological concepts that they involved, in such a manner as to convey to the student a clear notion of Rabbinic opinion of the doctrine under discussion."

The author tells us candidly that his attitude is a Jewish one, but not intentionally antagonistic to Christianity. He has a comprehensive grasp of his subject, and he writes clearly, confidently and convincingly, except for the man whose attitude is Christian.

A glance at the contents of the volume will show its scope. After the introduction, which is quite comprehensive, it treats of "God and the World," "God and Israel," "Election of Israel," "The Kingdom of God (Invisible)," "The Visible Kingdom (Universal)," "The Kingdom of God (National)," "The 'Law,'" "The Law as Personified in the Literature," "The Torah in Its Aspect of Law

(Mizwoth)," "The Joy of the Law," "The Zachuth of the Fathers: Imputed Righteousness and Imputed Sin," "The Law of Holiness and the Law of Goodness," "Sin as Rebellion," "The Evil Yezer: The Source of Rebellion," "Man's Victory by the Grace of God Over the Evil Yezer Created by God," "Forgiveness and Reconciliation With God," "Repentance: Means of Reconciliation."

VIRTUES AND SPIRITUAL COUNSEL OF FATHER NOAILLES, Founder of the Congregation of the Holy Family of Bordeaux. Translated from the French of Father Eugene Baffie, Oblate of Mary Immaculate, by Father John Fitzpatrick, of the same Congregation. 12mo., pp. 485. Benziger Brothers, New York, 1908.

The priest whose virtues we are about to study, of whose apostolate we would tell, was one of those good laborers of the Gospel who claim but one reward for their labors—that their names should be written in the Book of Life. Since his day, beyond the religious family of which he was the founder, the law-giver, the model and the father, few people have known of his existence and benefited by the treasures of his mind and heart. Too humble to think anything of himself, too much taken up with God's interests to think about his own in regard to the opinions of men, too deeply smitten with eternal things not to disdain even to excess the things that pass away, his life was useful rather than conspicuous, holy rather than brilliant.

Forty-four years have passed since his blessed death, and what a mountain of oblivion so long a lapse of time heaps up over a dead man's grave! And so, except within his spiritual family, how many are there who remember his apostolate or even his name?

Surely the life of such a man is worth the telling. Daily the lives of the wicked are written and spread out before the world in the newspapers. Their crimes are exaggerated, and multiplied, and painted in all their appalling details, until the whole world is scandalized, and the young especially become indifferent, cynical, sinful. How seldom do we read of the good deeds of men! How often do we not attribute bad motives to those who do good things. We should welcome a biography like the one before us because it is edifying, refreshing and fruitful. The author has followed the best rule by letting the subject speak for himself in his correspondence. He says:

"An author of our day has said: 'I look upon letters as the most vital part of biography. . . . If the secrets of our daily lives and of the depths of our souls can instruct others that survive us, let these be, in the future days, revealed to men as they are to-day

to God. Let dust return to dust and the secrets of the soul unto our kind, for mankind is natural heir to them.'

"The volume we now publish is, then, almost entirely Abbé Noailles' own, since it is made up of the most part of fragments of his vast correspondence, which we have fitted together in logical order, without, however, ever allowing ourselves to make any addition or any abridgement that would alter the man of God as he himself set it down."

WILLIAM CARDINAL ALLEN, Founder of the Seminaries. By *Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B.*, of Erdington Abbey. Foolscap, 8vo., pp. 194, illustrated. Benziger Brothers, New York, 1908.

This is another volume of the very neat and well chosen St. Nicholas Series, which already embraces such important subjects as Jeanne d'Arc, Blessed Thomas More, St. Thomas of Canterbury, Cardinal Pole and others. They contain much historical information, well chosen and skillfully edited. They will be popular and useful.

This short life of William Cardinal Allen does not pretend to be exhaustive. The writer has aimed at giving a picture of the man and of his great spiritual work for the faith in England, but the scope of this series has prevented him from going deeply into the political activities which had so great a share in Allen's closing years. The whole history of this aspect of the Cardinal's career will be found, together with the documents, in Father Knox's magnificent edition of "The Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen."

Nevertheless, the writer has not been able to pass over the political side of the Cardinal's life wholly in silence. He has written of it with all frankness and sincerity, not hesitating to put his finger on points in which he believes that this great man was misled. But in spite of his political mistakes, the life seems to become greater the more closely it is studied. Allen was a man of one idea; that idea was the conversion of England. For that he labored unceasingly; for that he endured voluntary exile, poverty, trials, calumnies, persecution; for that he undertook the great work with which his name will be forever associated; for that he lived, and with that hope in his heart he died. It is easy for us nowadays to point out his mistakes; it is not so easy to follow his glorious example.

The writer has often found, to his astonishment and sorrow, how little is known among English Catholics of this great man. He trusts that this short and inadequate biography will at least serve to interest them in his life and work. It may also, perhaps, be of service to some who are still outside the visible unity of the Church for which Allen worked and suffered so much.

LA QUESTION SOCIALE AU XVIII. SIECLE. Par *A. Lecoq.* One vol. in 16. Bloud et Cie, Paris.

LE TRAVAIL SOCIOLOGIQUE. LA METHODE. Par *P. Meline.* One vol. in 16. Bloud et Cie, Paris.

These two small volumes form part of the well-known series of works on sociology which are being issued by Messrs Bloud et Cie. The work of M. Meline may be considered an introduction to the science of sociology. It is less ambitious but more exact and methodical than the work of the late Herbert Spencer on the same subject. M. Meline insists on the objective study of sociology, without, however, neglecting the psychological or more spiritual aspects of the subject. He claims that in this respect French sociologists are superior to others. Indeed, he claims that sociology in its best sense is a French science. He condemns both the materialist and the idealist exponents of economic science, and he claims with much force that the true study of man in his social relations must lead to the conclusion that there is behind and above all an infinite design and a world superior to this (p. 117).

The work of M. A. Lecoq is a valuable contribution to the history of the social question. He deals with the eighteenth century, which was so prolific of social movements. He shows that the social question before and during the Revolution was not, as it is to-day, a question of capital and labor so much as a question of property. The aim of the great thinkers who occupied themselves with the social question in the eighteenth century was to discover some solution for the feudal burdens that lay heavy on all real estate. The grievances of the cultivators of the soil were many and grievous, and the theories of such men as Montesquieu, Morelly, J. J. Rousseau, Mably and the hosts of encyclopædists and physiocrats undoubtedly precipitated the overthrow of landlordism in France. Students of sociology who feel interested in its history cannot dispense with a knowledge of its history in the eighteenth century, and they can gather the main facts of that period from the excellent little work of M. Lecoq.

LES MODERNISTES. Par le *P. Vincent Maumus.* One vol. in 16. Double couronne, 2 fr. 50; franco, 2 fr. 75. Librairie Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, editeurs, rue de Rennes, 117, Paris.

This new book of P. Maumus is destined, we believe, to exercise a powerful and widely spread influence. It treats with unanswerable clearness and force of logic the momentous questions to which the Holy Father has drawn the world's attention in the encylclical Pascendi.

Amidst the numerous works which have treated of the con-

demned errors, this new publication has the distinctive merit of placing within reach of all readers not deeply versed in theological speculations those religious problems concerning which the modernists have made shipwreck of their faith. This popularization, if we may so call it, of the teaching of the Holy Father is all the more necessary in so far as the encyclical Pascendi has in certain circles been very much misunderstood, in France especially. There has been in some a tendency to look upon the encyclical as an attempt on the part of the Church to put a check or hindrance on intellectual culture and progress of science, and the modernists were regarded as the advanced pioneers of thought who fell victims to a gloomy obscurantism. Now the simple truth is that the modernists are nothing more than foolishly proud and self-conceited men, who in the name of false science pretend to change and, worse still, to destroy the ancient belief of the Church. Hence the necessity of bringing the debate between truth and error before the public, who without being theologians *ex professo* are deeply interested in religious questions. P. Maumus has supplied this much-felt want by writing his book with a clearness and vigor which render its perusal both attractive and instructive.

HISTOIRE DE L'INQUISITION EN FRANCE. I. Les Origines de l'Inquisition. Par *T. de Cauzons*. I. vol., 1-8. Pr., 7 francs. Bloud et Cie, editeurs, 7, rue Saint Sulpice, Paris.

For the last thirty years literature treating of the Inquisition has grown rich and broad. Numerous documents have been given forth to the world. Special studies have served to clear up doubtful questions. Some historians have attempted, with real success and genuine talent, to present a comprehensive and unified view of the problem. Thus, to name only the most recent, M. Ch. Lea in America and M. Vacandord in France may be mentioned. It is well known, however, that the impartiality of the former is not above all criticism, and that the luminous and high-toned essay of the latter has no pretention to be considered as an exhaustive treatment of the question.

M. de Cauzons' work is the first synthetic elaboration of the data furnished both by the direct study of the sources and by the investigation of modern erudition. It will comprise three volumes. The first of these has appeared and is occupied with the origins of the Inquisition. The book is written in a strikingly calm and unimpassioned tone, without any show of either bitterness or enthusiasm, and putting aside every thought of apology or criticism, places the testimonials and proofs of the controversy before the eyes of all.

Due praise must be bestowed upon the conscientious efforts of the writer, who gives us the hard-earned fruit of more than twenty years of minute research and profound reflection. Thanks to his labors, every reader can henceforth feel assured that what he reads in this work presents to him the Inquisition as it really was.

PHILOSOPHIA MORALIS AD MENTEM S. THOMAE AQUINATIS. Auctore *J. De Bie.* Pars I.: Philosophia Mor. Generalis. Lovanii, Typis F. et R. Centerick, 1908. Pr., 5 francs.

Cardinal Mercier, the Archbishop of Mechlin, in his letter prefixed to the present volume expresses his appreciation *de la clarté, la mithode, la sureté* of the work, and unquestionably these are the characteristics that strike the reader at once and impress themselves with ever deepening potency on his mind proportionately as he peruses the pages. The book embodies a summary of the author's lectures before the students of the Mechlin Seminary, and the characteristics just indicated are precisely those that reflect the experience gained by the practical professor respecting the pupil's needs. The doctrine is "sure," since it is that of St. Thomas developed and adjusted to present requirements; "the method" could hardly be surpassed in its formal orderliness—a quality to which the material setting of the book lends not a little, while the style is "clearness" itself. For the rest, though the body of the doctrine is, of course, that to be found in the average manual of scholastic ethics, the work contains two special features: 1. A *conspectus generalis historiae philosophiae moralis*—an exceedingly brief historical survey of ethics, it is true (pp. 7-18), still it is good for the student to have at least some such orientation at the start. 2. In connection with the influence of habits on conduct the author has appended a study of the abnormalities of consciousness, diseases and alterations of personality as they are usually called. The sketch, though also short, is serviceable in view of the recent discussion of the influence on morality of these pathological conditions. It should be noted in conclusion that the present volume is confined to general ethics only. A subsequent volume will treat of the application of the principles here developed to special rights and duties.

LE LIVRE D'AMOS. Par *J. Touzard,* professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Bloud et Cie, Paris, 1909. Pr., 3 francs.

The present is the initial volume in the Old Testament portion of the "Bibliotheque de l'Enseignment Scripturaire"—a series of commentaries on the individual books of the Bible. In the section

of the series devoted to the New Testament the volumes relating to the Synoptic Gospels and to the Acts of the Apostles have previously appeared. Students who are familiar with the Cambridge series of commentaries will recognize almost their counterpart at least in respect to method and general appearance, and will probably echo the wish that the present collection might be rendered into English for the benefit of readers not conversant with French. At any rate, those who have command of the latter language are now being supplied by the present series with commentaries which, while they safeguard Catholic teaching, utilize the best results of recent Biblical research. As regards the commentary at hand on the prophecy of Amos, the aim of the author has been to provide as exact as possible a translation of the Hebrew text with notes summarizing the interpretation found in the best recent works on the subject. The introduction is a scholarly essay, in which the historical environment of the prophet is well portrayed and the burden of his message clearly outlined. The volume will be a great help to teachers of the Bible as well as to the advanced student.

SCIENCE ET RELIGION. ETUDES POUR LES TEMPS PRESENT: "Les Livres de St. Patrice" par Georges Dottin; "Les Croisades" par Adrien Tortin; "Pensées de F. de la Mennais" par Christian Marechal; "Les Idées Morales de F. de la Mennais" par Jean des Cognets; "Le Pallium" par Jules Baudot; "I. Fioretti" par Arnold Goffin; "Nicole" par Henri Bremond; "Le Sens Catholique" par Henri Couget; "Les Idées Morales de Chateaubriand" par Maurice Souriau: "Le Vedisme" par Louis de la Vallée Poussin. Bloud et Cie, Paris, 1909.

Beside the encyclopædia in which "universal knowledge" is compacted within a score or more of quartos and domesticated only on the library shelf or desk, there is a demand in these days for a more liberal and fluent method of bringing "the circle of the sciences" within the convenient reach of busy readers and students. The enterprising house of Bloud & Co., Paris, have done much to meet this demand by the series of monographs which they publish under the above heading. The general title is comprehensive enough to take in a very large miscellaneous number of subjects. The collection embraces almost a score of departments, some of which have multiplied sub-divisions, the organization of the aggregate being as elastic as is compatible with the exigency of system. Under the general title above we have mentioned the most recent issues in the series. They refer to the departments of hagiography, history, philosophy, apologetics, liturgy. We cannot, of course, here describe the individual booklets. Though they are not all of equal merit or importance, the majority are excellent opuscles within their limits, solid and scholarly productions. Being the work for the most part

of specialists in their respective subjects, they are at once informing, interesting and suggestive of ways and instruments which the student can employ for more extended research. Not the least noteworthy feature of the collection is that while the booklets are generally neatly made brochures, their average price is but half a franc in Paris.

HISTOIRE DE LA FOUNDATION DE L'EGLISE: "La Revolution religieuse," one volume (pr. 3½ francs); "Le Christianisme primitif," one volume (Pr. 3½ francs). Par *Albert Dufourcq*, professeur à l'Université de Bourdeaux. Bloud et Cie, 7 Place Saint Sulpice, Paris.

These two volumes together constitute the second section of a larger work entitled "l'Avenir du Christianisme," some account of which was given in the last issue of the REVIEW. The author's dominant purpose is, while maintaining the transcendency of Christianity, to illustrate its relationship to antecedent Judaism and paganism. The present part surveys what he calls the *syncretist period*—the formative stage of Christianity—extending from the beginning down to Severus. The former of the two volumes at hand treats of the religious revolution, the personality and work of Christ and of St. Peter and his associates. The second volume treats of St. Paul, St. John and St. Ireneus. The central idea of the work here finds its fullest illumination—the Christianization of the world is seen in its emergence and strongest activity—its emanation, namely, from its Author, Christ, and its continuation through the immediate series of His vicegerents. The author has succeeded in holding a happy mean between wide generalities and vague philosophizings on the one hand and excessive accumulation of details on the other. Historical exposition of facts has thus been secured by no sacrifice of the interest of the narrative. The work has now reached the second half of its entirety. It should be noted, however, that each volume has a certain completeness and may be purchased independently of the rest.

HISTOIRE DU CATHOLICISME EN ANGLETERRE. Par *G. Planque*. One vol. in 16 de 128 pages. Pr., 1 fr. 20. Bloud et Cie, editeurs, 7, rue Saint Sulpice, Paris.

The aim of the writer is not to give a history of Catholic revival in England, so brilliantly treated of by eminent writers during these last few years. He seeks rather to furnish a prologue to the history of these latter events. Though Catholicity in England has been the subject of so many recent works of note, still it is remarkable that they deal as a rule only with the nineteenth century Catholicity, and

refer but little or not at all to the Catholicity of former periods. Now M. Planque offers a complete and conscientious resume of religious history in England from its origin up to the Reformation, and from the Reformation until the passing of the Emancipation Act in 1829. To retrace the sufferings of the English Catholics since the reign of Henry VIII. and to recall the glories of the ancient Church in England, in order that by the contrast on the one hand and by the analogy on the other we may the better feel and understand the present situation, such has been the view intended by the writer. The work is most timely, appearing as it does on the morrow of the Eucharistic Congress, which has manifested so remarkably the deep and earnest life of Catholic England. By a happy coincidence there appears at the same moment the new volume from the learned pen of M. Thureau-Dangin, "Le Catholicisme en Angleterre an XIX. Siècle" ("Catholicism in England in the Nineteenth Century"). Herein the public will be enabled to benefit by the results of the great labors of research and the profound erudition of the illustrious Academician, to whose work M. Planque's excellent volume will serve as a fitting introduction. We cheerfully recommend it as such to all readers.

LETTRES SUR LES ETUDES, ECCLESIASTIQUES. Par *S. G. Mgr. Mignot*, Archévèque d'Albi. One vol. in 12. Pr., 3 fr. 50. Paris, Librairie Victor Lecoffre, J. Gubalda et Cie, 90, rue Bonaparte.

The Archbishop of Albi, Mgr. Mignot, has yielded to many urgent requests by editing in one volume his "Letters on Ecclesiastical Studies" and the lecture delivered by him at Toulouse on the method of theology, some pertinent notes being appended to the work. In a very fine and masterly preface he resumes the chief ideas developed in the course of the treatise, in which simplicity of style enhances the beauty and charm which adorn its every page. The perusal of this volume has the advantage of engaging the student's interest and attention in branches of learning most fitted to maintain that high intellectual level to which the mind of ecclesiastics should be raised in order to be able to diffuse around them the light of truth.

Faithfully adhering to the directions of the Sovereign Pontiff, Mgr. Mignot shows how, in the unchanging and unchangeable Church, it is possible to institute a complete system of free theological research, of critical verification and of doctrinal development. These letters have for aim neither to exhaust the questions at issue nor to offer new solutions for their settlement. Their object is to inspire the reader with love of study, to awaken in his mind a lawful curiosity, a usefully inquisitive mode of thought, to indicate the

manner in which nowadays religious problems present themselves, to point out certain shoals and sandbanks, to call for due reflection—in a word, to furnish to the catechist and apologist a prudent and at the same time, progressive method of study and instruction.

LE JANSENISME. ETUDE DOCTRINALE. Par *J. Paquier.* Bloud et Cie, Paris, 1909. Pr., 5 francs.

There is no dearth of books dealing with Jansenism from an historical point of view—dealing especially with the long controversies and fierce quarrels between the Jansenists and their opponents. Works, however, that treat of the sadly famous heresy on its doctrinal side are not so abundant, and what there are, are for the most part antiquated or, being written in Latin and having a professionally theological character and aim, lie outside the purview of the general reader. There is room and doubtless also a demand, at least in France, for a work such as the one here introduced, which treats of Jansenism in its relation to the central Catholic doctrine, that, namely of grace, to which it is directly opposed; treats it philosophically and theologically, yet quite within the capacity and interest of the average intelligent reader. The fact that the book embodies a course of lectures delivered by the author at the Catholic Institute in Paris—lectures numerously attended and largely by the laity, women as well as men, may be cited as attesting to the unusual interest of the matter, or rather, we should say, of the manner, method, style, for the author possesses the happy art of making an abstruse and a seemingly technical subject plain and simple and even attractive. Those to whom the subject appeals may be assured of being amply repaid by reading the book, especially the closing chapter, which throws some vivid light on the "miracles" of Jansenism.

BIBLIOPHOROS DECURRENTIS LITERATURAE SCIENTIAE CATHOLICAE. Praecipuo in hoc genere libros exhibens quos omnis natio in dies affert una cum operibus judiciis ex clarioribus periodicis excerptis vel a peculiaris disciplinae. Professoribus prolatis Doct. E. Schmitt et Prof. Doct. I. Sestiti studio conlato compilationem recensentibus. Vol. I., Fasc. II. Januarius, Romae, 1909. M. Bretschneider, Leibr. Editor.

The ample title here delineated is sufficiently descriptive of the undertaking inaugurated—viz., a quarterly review of current Catholic literature appearing in every country. The undertaking is as to its scope original, and if it receive adequate support cannot but do a distinct service to scholars by keeping them—as it bids fair to do—*au courrant* with at least the broad lines of Catholic biblio-

graphy. There are some thirteen branches of knowledge represented, and many leading works that have recently appeared in Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, German and even in English are briefly described. Obviously the Latin language alone lends itself to such a vehicle. The book notices, while necessarily brief, are on the whole sufficiently descriptive to guide the reader to what he may want. We welcome the *Bibliophoros* and wish it success. The price is sixty-five cents per annum—surely modest enough.

ART ET APOLOGETIQUE. Par *A. D. Sertillanges*, professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. One vol. in 16 de la collection Etudes de philosophie et de critique religieuse. Pr., 3 fr. 50. Bloud et Cie, ed., 7, rue Saint Sulpice, Paris.

The problem which M. Sertillanges proposes to study and elaborate in this recent work is the relation subsisting between apologetics, whose necessity is evident at the present time, and art, which claims universal sympathy and exercises universal power. In developing his theme the author allows a wide range to the terms of the problem. In several chapters, combining strength of thought with elegance of style, he shows successively how art evokes religious feeling, how it expresses religious feeling and religious events, what is the artistic value of religious feeling in general and in particular of Catholic Christianity. He then answers the objections raised in the name of complete art and of life against Christianity. In a final chapter he treats of modern religious art. We find then that the book deals exhaustively with the set of questions which confront the æsthetic as well as the religious mind. The eminent professor of the Catholic Institute at Paris has furnished a book of such a kind as had hitherto no existence and which will be welcomed by all those readers who cherish a sincere love for religious truth as well as for artistic beauty.

HELLADIAN VISTAS. By *Don Daniel Quinn, Ph. D.*, successively student of American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece; professor of Greek at Mount St. Mary's College, Maryland; professor of Greek at the Catholic University, Washington, and rector of the Leonteion, Athens, Greece; now pastor of St. Paul's, Yellow Springs, Ohio, and professor at Antioch College. Second edition, 12mo., pp. 407. Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1909.

"The following chapters have already appeared in print as magazine articles. They are republished with the kind permission of the editors of *Harper's Magazine*, the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY, the *Catholic World, Donahoe's Magazine* and the *Catholic Uni-*

versity Bulletin. Frequent repetitions of thought and expression have been allowed to remain, although almost inexcusable."

These essays were written by the reverend author generally, if not always, during a residence of several years in Greece. They embrace a wide range of subjects, including customs, beliefs, localities, ruins, etc., and all have that special value which must attach to the writings of a specialist who is an enthusiastic student and who labors in a remote field, not easily accessible, and rather hard in the tilling. Dr. Quinn writes in a charming manner, bringing an enthusiasm to his work which vivifies it. His standing as a Greek scholar places his accuracy beyond question.

LES ASSEMBLEES DU CLERGE ET LE PROTESTANTISME. Par *I. Bourlon.* One vol. in 16 de 128 pp. Pr., 1 fr. 20. Librairie Bloud et Cie.

The assemblies of the clergy, which had become periodical towards the end of the sixteenth century, were intended above all to adopt measures for the material interests of the Church in France. But in course of time and from the very nature of things they took in hands all its interests, both spiritual and temporal. What was their line of conduct towards the Protestants? This is a question about which much controversy has been carried on in former times and much prejudice still prevails at the present day. No writer could have been more fittingly chosen to treat this important problem in history than M. Bourlon, the author of the well-known work "Assemblées du Clergé Sous l'ancien Régime" and also of the important and scholarly volume entitled "Assemblées du Clergé et le Jansénisme."

LA DEDICACE DES EGLISES. Par *J. Baudot, O. S. B.* One vol. in 12. Pr., 0 fr. 60. Bloud et Cie, editeurs, 7, rue Saint Sulpice, Paris.

The consecration or dedication of churches is defined as a sacred act, or rather a combination of sacred and solemn acts, appointed and determined by the Church, and whose effect is to render an edifice sacred, and for evermore dedicated to God and to His worship, this act or these acts being performed by a lawful minister of the Church, so that the edifice, hitherto profane, but now and forever holy and sacred, may serve as a sanctuary for celebration of the divine and ecclesiastical offices. It is this liturgical rite, of great importance and interest to all ecclesiastics which forms the subject of the opusculum published by the learned Benedictine, J. Boudot. It comprises two parts: First, the historical development of the ceremony

of dedication; second, the canonical and liturgical regulations of the rite of dedication and its symbolism.

DIARY AND NOTEBOOK FOR 1909. Designed for the Special Use of the Reverend Clergy. 16mo., cloth, net, 75 cents. Benziger Brothers, Cincinnati, New York, Chicago.

The third issue of the "Diary and Notebook" is slightly different from the two previous editions, the most striking feature being the omission of the Ordo and the addition of a few thoughts for meditation each day. Although there may be some difference of opinion as to the wisdom of the omission, no one can question the value of the addition, and all will acknowledge the excellence of the book in general as to the matter, the plan, the presentation and the correctness. Indeed, Father Schulte's name is a guarantee of all this, and we expect nothing less from him. We doubt if any one could gather a greater amount of useful, necessary information into so small a space and state it so clearly.

HENRY CHARLES LEA'S HISTORICAL WRITINGS. A Critical Inquiry into their Method and Merit. By *Paul Maria Baumgarten*. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Joseph Wagner, 1909.

A review of Henry C. Lea's work translated from the German seems odd at first, especially to Mr. Lea's fellow citizens of Philadelphia, but an examination of the book will prove that it is worth going so far to get so good a thing.

It has always been a matter of surprise to observers in this country, as it was to the German author of this book, that a layman like Mr. Lea should choose for his life work a field of historical research which requires a philological, philosophical and historical training which very few men ever acquire, and which Mr. Lea has never acquired; which requires, moreover, a mental balance and a calm, cool, fair judgment, free from bias and prejudice, which is partly inherited and partly acquired, and which Mr. Lea has not gotten in either way, and which, finally, calls for an indifference as to the final result of the search after truth which leads the student invariably to the right conclusion, and indicates in its possessor a bigness almost superhuman, and Mr. Lea is very human. If Mr. Lea had devoted the same amount of time and labor and money to some undertaking, to some work for which he was better equipped, he would have accomplished more good and earned more merit. Now, as his long life draws to a close, he sees before him, as the result of his life work, several large volumes treating of subjects which he never understood, and which, while they may draw applause from the multitude, make the judicious few grieve. We have sufficient respect for Mr. Lea to think that he would prefer the approval of the latter.

Mr. Lea's profuseness, as well as his method, makes a systematic and free review of his works impossible. Hence, Monsignor Baumgarten follows the lead of Dr. Bouquillon and Father Casey, S. J., in this country by discrediting him. In this spirit he takes up in turn Auricular Confession, Indulgences. The Inquisition of the Middle Ages, The Spanish Inquisition and The Sacred Penitentiary. We freely subscribe to what the publishers claim for the book, namely: that it is a notable review of Mr. Lea's volumes on the history of Auricular Confession and other institutions of the Church. The author, himself an historian of repute, views Mr. Lea's work in the light of modern historical research, and offers much proof, in the shape of quotations from other eminent historians and from original records, in support of his charge that Mr. Lea's data are not always correct, that he made errors in the use of his material, and that he was prejudiced in his deductions.

The following quotations from Monsignor Baumgarten's introduction are good specimens of his method:

"A peculiarity of Lea's method, observed in all his volumes, and one which renders the tracing of his deductions at times difficult, is his habit to quote sources in more or less slipshod fashion. His authorities for various matters, dealt with on two or more pages, are frequently lumped together in one common annotation; the books quoted from are enumerated in the informal fashion of the old French and Italian schools, various editions of quoted books are hardly ever distinguished; bibliographical exactness is lacking, folios of quoted passages are omitted oftener than is to the liking of the critical reader, and not infrequently are the sources of quoted documents only suggested. Thus the critical reader has his troubles, due to this supreme disregard for the requirements of modern scientific writing. It may be suggested in passing that this indifference does not seem to manifest any great amount of respect, on part of the author, for the readers to whom he addresses himself. Whenever there is a lack of documentary proof, Lea chooses to present his matter in a form which a careful and conscientious historian would endeavor to avoid. The words 'doubtless' and 'evidently' play a conspicious part in his writings, and as a significant fact, chiefly there, where the matter allows of most diverse conjectures. And Lea's conclusions, in a great many instances, are not so 'doubtless' as he would fain have them believed to be. 'We can readily conceive;' 'we may easily imagine;' 'it can be readily understood;' such and similar expressions, often occurring, will warn the reader to look sharp unless he is willing to accept Lea's hypothesis as a proved fact, proved by one of Lea's phrases. Lea's use of many quotations, from sources in print or manuscript, admits, with the most generous allowance, of no other characterization but that of a misrepresentation of their meaning, the meaning they will convey in connection with their context. The earmarks of the card index product are here plainly and painfully apparent.

"But this is not the worst. There are quotations in Lea's books which can only be described as falsifications of their sense

in the full meaning of the term. Until proof to the contrary is at hand, let us suppose that we have before us objective falsifications. The knowledge of medieval theology and of the Canon Law prevailing at that time, with which Lea obviously equipped himself, affords the basis of this severe reproach, for which I shall furnish proof in the course of this review. It is difficult to understand why Lea should have resorted to such questionable means, when he had ample opportunity to give, in other ways, expression to his aversion for the Church and her representatives. He actually availed himself, to a great extent, of such opportunities, and frequently uses expressions of such coarseness that the reader asks himself in astonishment whether they are warranted by the facts described according to Lea's method. These are phenomena whose psychological and scientifical explanation is not apparent to me; I simply record the fact, therefore, and leave it to the reader to draw his own conclusions."

ALCUIN CLUB COLLECTIONS:

VIII. The "Interpretations" of the Bishops, and their Influence on Elizabethan Episcopal Policy. With an Appendix of the Original Documents. By *W. M. Kennedy.*

IX. The Edwarden Inventories for Buckinghamshire. Edited by *F. C. Eeles, F. R. Hist. S., F. S. A. Scot.*, from transcripts by the Rev. J. E. Brown, B. A., Vicar of Studham. 8vo., boards, pp. 42+156. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This book is not a new work on first aid to the injured, nor instructions for those who save the body, but it is the soul-saver's guide for those who labor in a field that is very ripe and that needs many reapers.

"The author has written with the aim of furthering religion in those whose loyalty to the holy cause will do the most toward stemming the rising tide of unbelief, anarchy and immorality; for assuredly spiritual advancement is of its very highest efficacy in the directions just named when secured in our boys, destined to be heads of families and leaders in all departments of life.

"And yet these arbiters of the future carry the seed of pretty much all the evil that is to be. Bless their innocent sisters, who stand so little in need of preservative care! Indeed, in godliness of life, the gentle half of our race could easily hold its own if only the sterner partner would cease playing the role of tempter. Take care of the boys, then, and the girls will take care of themselves. Nay, more; could but half of the obstreperous scamplings be made into anything like perfect men, feminine virtue, thereby obtaining fuller play, would almost repair the primeval lapse and restore the world to a paradise anew."

This declaration has the ring of experience, earnestness and confidence. The experience has had that best of all effects, toleration. Hence the author does humbly say that he does not dictate, but suggests.

"However, warm interest in youth does not burden these pages

with a dictatorial tone. They are written for the purpose of simply suggesting divers measures, all of them tested during years of personal experience, which it is hoped may be found helpful to practical friends of city boys."

"And while a special form of first communion preparation, operative apart from fraternities, is presented at the close of this volume, the expedients to be offered are mainly in favor of societies; they, consequently, are proposed for use on our young friends as on an evasive, rather disorderly, and more or less wayward element to be gathered into organizations, and, through the organizations, to be controlled and improved."

Those who have charge of boys often make the mistake of trying to care for them without discrimination as to age. Persons of experience never make this mistake. One soon learns, also, that in all parishes, boys, between school age and young manhood, need most care.

"The devotion of the present undertaking solely to subjects in their teens appears in the undertaking's very title. On the one hand, a conspicuous presentment of this limitation seems called for as emphasizing the writer's earnest objection to the admission of youngsters (apparently) twelve years of age, or younger.

"There is, furthermore, a second and still more important reason for making the limitation unmistakably clear; it is that in discussions on our subject, the word 'boys' is very frequently used to signify juveniles and adolescents of all ages, including even persons who have passed their majority. Now this ambiguous and hopelessly confusing acceptance of an all-important term is justly obviated by the permanent declaration that the 'boys' of the present pages are really such, and are to be provided for according to the demands and facilities of their special time of life.

"For, considered as material for pious societies, young fellows, between thirteen and eighteen, form a well-defined category of their own.

"Meanwhile, I suggest no particular kind of society; only measures which, it is hoped, will be found applicable here and there to religious bodies in general. In fact, any idea of securing absolute unity of formation in juvenile associations must be replaced with a welcome to diversity of formation, when we note that secondary, but important, aims should vary with local circumstances, and that even fraternities, the same in name and general purpose, ought to show differences resulting from the fact that each worker wisely manages by ways and means chosen to suit his own individual disposition and taste."

It is clear from these quotations that the author has passed the experimental stage, and that he speaks confidently and definitely. Indeed, priests who have to care for boys in parishes, and it may be safely said, that all have this duty pressing on them, could take this book as a guide, and follow it safely and profitably from beginning to end. We do not say that it might not be modified in some respects to meet special needs, or to fit into special conditions; but it is a sound foundation for work of this kind.

One claim of the author is especially noteworthy, namely, that specialists are not required for this work, but every priest can do

it. The best recommendation of all is that the author has proven everything that he recommends.

THE GREEK VERSIONS OF THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS. Edited from Nine MSS. Together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and some Hebrew Fragments. By *R. H. Charles, D. Litt., D. D.*, Grinfield lecturer on the Septuagint, Oxford fellow of the British Academy. 8vo., pp. 324. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1908.

Here is a book which required the work of a scholar and an enthusiast to produce it. A full knowledge of Hebrew, Greek and Latin were prerequisites, and tireless, earnest study were necessary accompaniments. The author says:

"A new text of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs has long been needed. It is now nearly forty years since Dr. Sinker published a reproduction of the Cambridge MS., with the variants of the Oxford MS. Ten years later he edited collations of the Vatican and Patmos MSS. Dr. Sinker's own work was very accurate as far as it went, but he made no attempt to deal with the relations of the MSS. to each other, and to the archetypes from which they were derived. The MSS. evidence was, indeed, hardly adequate for such a task, and, moreover, the pre-suppositions under which he worked—as also all other students of the Testaments till within the last few years, *i.e.*, that the Testaments were written originally in Greek and by a Christian author—precluded the possibility of ever attaining to a satisfactory text."

He gives a short account of the book in these words:

"The Testaments were orginally written in Hebrew by a Pharisaic upholder of the Maccabean priest kings in the closing years of the second century, B. C. In the course of the next century the Hebrew text was interpolated with additions emanating from bitter opponents of the Maccabean dynasty. In the early decades of the Christian era the text was current in two forms, which are denoted by the Ha and Hb in this edition. The former of these was translated not later than A. D. 50, into Greek, and this translation was used by the scholar who rendered the second Hebrew recension into Greek. The first Greek translation was used by our Lord, by St. Paul, and by other New Testament writers. In the second and following centuries it was interloped by Christian scribes, and finally condemned indiscriminatingly along with other apocryphs. For several centuries it was wholly lost sight of, and it was not until the thirteenth century that it was rediscovered through the agency of Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, who translated it into Latin, under the misconception that it was a genuine work of the twelve sons of Jacob, and that the Christian interpolations were a genuine product of Jewish prophecy. The advent of the Reformation brought in critical methods, and the book was unethical side, to come into its own, and the text, with all the docujustly disparaged as a mere Christian forgery for nearly four centuries. The time has at last arrived for this book, so noble in its mentary authorities, is now laid before the student."

It is not our purpose to take up the question of the merits of

the work in detail, because that it is a serious matter that cannot be done in a few moments and a few words. It is rather our desire to bear witness to the painstaking, thorough manner in which the author has labored to cover the field chosen, and to do justice to the subject. It is a work which requires a more than ordinary equipment, with much patience, and we doubt not both have borne good fruit in this instance.

THE ELIZABETHAN RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT. A Study of Contemporary Documents. By *Henry Norbert Birt, O. S. B.*, priest of Downside Abbey. 8vo., pp. 595. George Bell & Sons, London, 1907.

Here is a splendid example of historical writing of the best kind covering a period in history rich in matter, and richer still in documents. It has a lasting value which will give it place in permanent collections. The following quotation is well worthy of reproduction in full:

"A few words only of personal explanation seem to be called for to inform the reader how this book came into being, and for what purpose. It has grown inperceptibly out of a series of circumstances. Some ten or eleven years ago I undertook to index a mass of loose papers, extracts from various manuscript sources made by the late Richard Simpson, Esq., during his 'Edmund Campion.' This directed my attention to the value of these papers; but as Mr. Simpson's work extended mostly from 1580 onward, I determined, under Abbot Gasquet's advice, to make a similar collection for the earlier half of Elizabeth's reign up to 1580. This task of mere transcription from original documents resulted in some four or five years of assiduous work, which taught me much of the actualities of things, of which I had previously but a dim conception, formed from the usual printed sources of information. Then there came into my hands, amongst others, two books in particular, recently published: Dr. Mandell Creighton's 'Elizabeth' and Rev. H. Gee's 'Elizabethan Clergy,' 1558-1564, which ran counter so completely to my own growing convictions, that I determined to set forth the facts as the original documents had presented them to me. It was only when a huge mass of papers, gathered from widely scattered sources, came to be dovetailed together, that the true conclusion from the facts grew on my mind, and at last took a definite shape. I started to write with no preconceived notion of proving a thesis already held. But the very fitness of things seemed to require an explanation wholly wanting in books of the nature referred to, yet which was adequately supplied in the papers here presented in substance or in outline to the reader.

"I do not suppose for one instant that I shall be fortunate enough to produce material hitherto unknown to serious students of Elizabethan history; this book is not meant so much for persons accustomed to study original sources for themselves as it is intended to help the ordinary reader with no opportunities of diving below the surface, and who must, therefore,

be content to accept conclusions of others. And in the domain of history, especially, it is so often the case that a judgment is pronounced and a student is constrained to follow it without the possibility being open to him in most cases of verification or control. Moreover, in general histories, isolated events or phases must be treated broadly, and the happenings of months or years are dismissed in a few words or sentences. But when a particular series of events or a special period is singled out for separate treatment, details can be set out more fully, and judgments can in consequence be more matured through the full presentment of contemporary documentary evidence. This has been the purpose actuating the following pages. The student is enabled to read for himself the very words and sentiments of the people whose actions have had such momentous influence on the religious life of England, and can form his own judgment. To render the task as easy as possible, while the diction has been left untouched, the orthography has been modernized throughout.

"In conclusion, I have to express my deep obligations to Abbot Gasquet for valuable advice at every stage of my long task; what that advice has meant to me, his reputation as a historical student testifies."

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. The Renaissance and Protestantism. Lectures given at the Catholic Institute of Paris, January to March, 1904. By *Alfred Baudrillart*, rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris. With a prefatory letter from His Eminence Cardinal Perraud, of the French Academy. Authorized translation by Mrs. Philip Gibbs. Benziger Brothers, New York.

This is Volume IV of the *International Catholic Library*, edited by Rev. J. Wilhelm, D. D. This series is making an excellent class of accessibles to English readers. The present volume deals with a fascinating subject, or subjects, the "Renaissance" and the "Reformation." The author is especially well-fitted for the work, having made a close study of the subject for many years and having taught it three times in ten years. Cardinal Perraud speaks of it in the highest terms. He says:

"A brief acquaintance with your work is sufficient to convince your readers or audience of your scrupulous care in making it your duty to go always to original sources of information, and that you contemn those careless methods of research which consists in borrowing conclusions ready made, save for slight modification of form, from second-hand authors.

"Another merit of your work is that you have known how to acknowledge certain faults with absolute sincerity in those with whom we, as Catholics, claim fellowship, and to accord due justice to our adversaries.

"You have just put into practice the brave and noble advice given by Leo XIII. to those, who like you, have the honor of teaching ecclesiastical history. Having reminded them of this saying in the book of Job: 'Hath God any need of your lie?' the great Pope adds these lines, and it gives me pleasure to apply them to you.

"The historian of the Church will be strong in proportion as he insists upon her Divine origin, which is superior to every concept of a merely worldly and natural institution, and the more loyal he is in dissembling none of those trials to which the faults of her children, and sometimes even her ministers, have subjected the Spouse of Christ in the course of centuries. When studied thus, the history of the Church constitutes itself a splendid and conclusive demonstration of the truth and divinity of Christianity.

"The impartiality, of which you give such convincing proofs, especially in your treatment of the delicate and difficult question of the Inquisition, has equipped you well for the study and appreciation of the causes, developments and results of that great religious crisis of modern times known as the Protestant Reformation.

"How will your lectures justify the exalted and almost prophetic views of the immortal author of 'L'Histoire des Variations' and the 'Avertissements aux Protestants?' How pleased Bossuet would have been to read your works and to know how thoroughly you bear him out in showing 'how the general foundation laid by the Reformation—namely, contempt for the authority of the Church, the denial of the Apostolic succession, the indictment of the preceding centuries, and even the contempt of the Fathers, the bursting of every barrier, and the complete abandonment of human curiosity to its own devices—must inevitably produce what we have seen—namely unbridled license in all religious matters.'"

THE BOY-SAVERS' GUIDE. Society Work for Lads in their Teens. By *Rev. George E. Quin, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 389. Benziger Brothers, New York, 1908.

These new numbers are valuable additions to the list of publications of the Alcuin Club, founded for the purpose of promoting the study of the history and use of the Book of Common Prayer.

The importance of number eight may be judged from this introductory note by the author:

"This document has been much discussed of late years. It has, therefore, been thought well to print the three manuscript copies. There can be no doubt that it shaped the policy of Parker and his brethren in more respects than one, and represents a sort of mutual basis for the Episcopal policy."

Publication number nine is still more interesting. We read in the introduction: "The political exigencies of Henry VIII's breach with the Pope caused him to suppress the English monastic houses, with the twofold end of crushing that part of the body spiritual which was the strongest bulwark of the papal power in England, and of obtaining lands to grant to the nobility, so that he might secure their favor and support. Begun in 1535, under the pretext of suppressing some of the lesser houses on account of their corruption, this policy of sacrilege went on until every religious house was gone, and in 1545 it was extended to colleges, chantries and

free chapels, although it seems that the seizure of the plate and ornaments of these latter did not take place until early in the reign of Edward VI. It is easy to see that this work of sacrilege and confiscation was not likely to stop short of parish churches, and it began to be extended to them at the very beginning of the reign of Edward VI. Enquiries as to the goods of parish churches were made of the bishops in 1547, and early in 1549 a commission for making inventories was issued to sheriffs and justices of the peace."

These inventories were made, and the actual seizure of all valuables followed, only the barest necessities being left for the use of each church. The plate was sent to the Jewel House in the Tower of London and melted down; the vestments and the inferior metal work were sold locally; the linen given to the poor. Thus the sacrilege was complete.

This great series of sixteenth century inventories, despite its shameful origin, is of the highest legal, historical and liturgical value. The editor very well says:

"Until all such inventories are printed accurately and published in an accessible way, it is impossible to form a just estimate of their contents, or to write a detailed history of the spoliation of our churches by Henry VIII. and Edward VI., or, indeed, to deal properly with the subject of church furniture and ornaments in the sixteenth century in England as a whole."

The Alcuin Club intends to do this as soon as possible. It has already brought out two such publications, and we have the third before us.

THE CATECHISM IN EXAMPLES. By *Rev. D. Chisholm*, priest of the Diocese of Aberdeen. Second edition. In five volumes. Vol. I. Faith: The Creed. Vol. II. Hope: Prayer. 12mo., pp. 438. Benziger Brothers, New York.

This book will be universally commended. Without one dissenting voice, all will agree that suitable stories to illustrate the catechism, are very important and most desirable. It is not easy to find them. The author succeeded.

The unprecedented success which attended the publication of the First Edition of "The Catechism in Examples," and the demand which is now being constantly made for the book, has induced the author to undertake the publication of an entirely new edition, in which, while adhering to the original plan, he has not only thoroughly revised, but also considerably developed, the contents of the work.

The book in its first form found its way literally into every part of the world, and demands for a re-issue have recently reached the author from almost every country in the continent of Europe, as well as from America, Australia, Africa, North and South; Ireland especially has been most zealous in its propagation in the past, and in present demands for its re-appearance.

St. Gregory the Great tells us that more men are drawn towards heaven by the force of example than by the effects of argument. If this be true in reference to mankind in general, it is especially so with regard to the child. The child is formed on example. The

truths of faith learned in catechism are for the most part unintelligible to him. He requires to have them sketched out as in a picture before he can take in their meaning. Children delight in stories, and they are not slow to catch the moral sense these are intended to convey. If these stories are life-like, and within the reach of their own practice, they try to imitate what is told in them. Long experience and the example of great and holy men, who have in this, as in other things, followed the example of Our Blessed Lord Himself, have convinced the author of this book of the necessity of bringing out in bold relief, by means of examples, the truths contained in catechism.

It was this that induced him to undertake this work. Each example has been carefully chosen to bring home to the mind of the child some one of the great truths of our holy Faith, and fix it there.

This new edition consists of five volumes, corresponding to the five parts of the catechism; each volume containing about four hundred examples, interspersed with moral reflections, so that each part of the catechism is gradually set before the mind of the child in such a way as to captivate his attention in a practical and pleasing manner, and enable him to understand more easily and more clearly the explanations given by his pastor and parents.

DANGERS OF THE DAY. By *Mgr. John S. Vaughan*. With an Introduction by Mgr. Canon Moyes. 12mo., pp. 239. The Ave Maria Press, Notre Dame, Ind.

Monsignor Vaughan does not need an introduction to American readers. He is already well known through his several books, and especially "Thoughts for All Times," "Faith and Folly," and "Concerning the Holy Bible."

In the eight sermons or essays, which make up his book, the author treats of "Our Environment," "The Enchantments of the World," "Calling Good Evil, and Evil Good," "The Inordinate Love of Money," "Indiscriminate Reading," "Knowledge That Puffeth Up," "Intemperance," "Impurity, the Sovereign Seduction." Pregnant subjects—all. As Canon Moyes says in the introduction: "The eight chapters of this book are as so many danger signals, pointing to the perils which surround us in the life of to-day."

The first chapter, on "Environment," is a fair sample, and it is a clear, startling statement of the effect of the atmosphere in which we live, no less, detrimental in the moral order than in the physical, but rather more so. He says, and it applies to America as well as England:

"Our lot is cast in a non-Catholic country; we are constantly moving among Protestants, Jews, agnostics, unbelievers. We frequent their assemblies; we share in their amusements; we visit their houses; we correspond and transact business with them; we interchange courtesies,—in fact, we live on terms of familiarity with all sorts and conditions of men, and are glad to number them among our friends, associates and companions."

The press, the magazines, the books of the present day, are, for the most part, Protestant and heretical, non-Catholic or anti-Catholic, unmoral or immoral. And thus we find the whole moral and intellectual atmosphere in which we live heavily charged with the

poisonous exhalations and noxious vapors of every variety of heresy and infidelity, and erroneous opinion, both old and new.

The danger we have especially to guard against is that of adapting ourselves too readily to our present vitiated and irreligious environment.

The author develops his subject along these lines very logically and very convincingly. The other chapters are not less important and interesting, and the book will do much good.

FOUR-SQUARE, or, The Cardinal Virtues. Addresses to Young Men. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 93. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

The Preface is characteristic of the author; it says:

"These addresses have appeared in the *Homiletic Monthly.* They are written rather with an eye to scientific accuracy than to unction, eloquence and rhetoric; for surely conduct is a matter of science."

Those who have known Father Rickaby by his philosophical writings only, and who recall the subtlety of his reasoning requiring the training of a philosopher to follow him, will be surprised to learn that in these addresses he speaks to young men who have no philosophical training, but who are equipped with an ordinary education and common sense. They appeal to the intellect rather than the heart, or rather, they appeal to the heart through the intellect, which is a method well adapted to this intellectual (?) age. It has almost become fashionable in the smart set to deny or ignore fundamental moral truths, and, sad to relate, children of the Church of Jesus Christ are sometimes tainted with this smartness. Father Rickaby's addresses are for just such persons. This book should be part of the curriculum of every educational institution in this country. But that is too much to hope for. If it could be placed in the hands of all the Catholic students of non-Catholic educational institutions throughout the country the result would be splendid.

As the review in the *Month* says, "the book is a model of luminous exposition, both convincing and stimulating." And again: "The apt example, the crisp phrase, the shrewd qualification, the sane outlook, the lucidity and moderation of the whole make these discourses delightful reading."

Finally, they are not intended for men only, but are equally applicable to both sexes and all ages.

ANSELM'S THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT. The Bohlen Lectures, 1903. By *George Cadwalader Foley, D. D.*, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Care in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia. 12mo., pp. 327. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

As to the occasion:

"John Bohlen, who died in this city on the 26th day of April, 1874, bequeathed to trustees a fund of one hundred thousand dollars to be distributed to religious and charitable objects in accordance with the well-known wishes of the testator.

"By a deed of trust, executed June 2, 1875, the trustees, under the will of Mr. Bohlen, transferred and paid over to 'The Rector,

Church Wardens and Vestrymen of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia,' in trust, a sum of money for certain designated purposes, out of which fund the sum of ten thousand dollars was set apart for the endowment of THE JOHN BOHLEN LECTURESHIP, upon the following terms and conditions:

"According to the conditions, the income from this fund is to be given each year to some qualified person, clergyman or layman, for the delivery and publication of two or more lecture sermons on such subjects as are chosen for the 'Bampton Lectures,' at Oxford, or any other subject distinctly connected with or relating to the Christian religion. The appointing board consists of the Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of which is the Church of the Holy Trinity; the Rector of said church; and three professors of the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia."

As to the book: we must confess we feel like asking, *"cui bono?"* For the Catholic, Anselm's theory of the atonement is the Catholic theory of the atonement, and we fear that the author has wandered afar for an explanation which was quite near. The Catholic doctrine of the atonement has been the same from the beginning; will be the same until the end. The development of doctrine is quite different from change of doctrine or difference of doctrine. This is a truth which should be easy to learn, and yet it seems to present insurmountable obstacles to many.

We are quite sure this book will not be of any use to Catholics, and we are not quite sure it will be of use to anyone else.

LE COMITE DE SALUT PUBLIC. Par *Marcel Navarre.* One vol. in 12. Bloud et Cie, editeurs, 7, rue Saint Sulpice, Paris.

M. Marcel Navarre retraces in this book the history of a revolutionary institution which was particularly active and flourishing in its kind. Its first formation, its work under the preponderating activity of Danton, and afterwards under Robespierre's dictatorship, the circumstances that brought about the loss of its influence and its final extinction after the 9 Thermidor—all these successive events are detailed by M. Navarre with exactitude and impartiality. Although he recognizes the incontestable grandeur, as he considers it, of the French Revolution, he cannot refrain from expressing his horror and execration of this reign of hatred and tyranny at the conclusion of his sketch, thereby recalling the view of Joseph de Maistre, who stigmatized it as "satanical."

A COMPENDIUM OF CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION. Edited by *Rev. John Hagan,* Vice Rector of the Irish College, Rome. The Sacraments, Parts I. and II. 8vo., pp. 244 and 292. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"To each chapter, or part of chapter, of the 'Catechismus Romanus,' is appended the corresponding portion of the 'Compendium of Christian Doctrine,' prescribed by Pius X, in 1905, for use in the various dioceses of the Province of Rome, and, accompanied

by the earnestly expressed desire to see it adopted by at least all Italy." Then follows one or more instructions or sermons on the Sacraments in general, or on some particular Sacrament. So that we have the Catechism of the Council of Trent, the Catechism of Pius X., and the Instruction or Sermon by Raineri, we presume, although there is nothing to indicate what part of the work Father Hagan has done, except the announcement that he has edited it.

The instructions are the only new feature of the work, and they are very good. An objection might be made to twenty-two pages of catechism and eleven pages of instruction, which is the proportion of space devoted to the Sacraments in general, but such objection would probably come with most force from priests, who have the Roman Catechism, and others, in their libraries.

The objection might be made with more force since the Roman Catechism is so very full, and since the author of the Instructions repeats it to a great extent.

The book is excellently made, and presents an attractive appearance.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL DIRECTOR'S GUIDE TO SUCCESS. By *Rev. Patrick J. Sloan*, author of "The Sunday School Teacher's Guide to Success." 12mo., pp. 271. Benziger Brothers, New York.

To afford some assistance to those who are laboring in the work of teaching Christian doctrine, is the sole purpose of this volume. The principles and methods of catechetical instruction found therein have been carefully and deliberately gleaned from the various sources. The best of experience has pronounced them to be most practical and efficacious. They are expressed in a form as clear, direct, concise, and yet comprehensive, as was found possible, and are submitted to the serious and prayerful consideration of pastors and Sunday-school directors. These methods may be old, but they are of vital and supreme importance, and adapted by wise usage to new needs and conditions. They have brought great success to many; if rightly followed, under like circumstances, they will bring a similar success to all, by pointing out and lighting up the way along which the little ones of Christ may be led nearer unto His sacred Heart, and more surely and safely into heaven.

THE CASUIST. A Collection of Cases in Moral and Pastoral Theology. Vol. II. 8vo., pp. 317. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

This second volume of cases in moral and pastoral theology is an improvement on the first volume, because about one-half of the cases have the author's names attached. It could be still further improved if the name of the author appeared on the title-page, or if it were attached to the other cases. The subjects are well chosen, the cases are all practical, and they are all skilfully handled. The author or editor quotes approved authorites in a clear definite manner, but he ought to go a step further and sign his work. It is not always convenient to verify quotations, and many priests have not the books quoted. The name of the author would be a guarantee of faithfulness, and beget a confidence which is very important in matters of this kind.

70766

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM